



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2019

No. 7

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 14, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY G. BROWN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

OPEN UP THE GOVERNMENT AND SECURE OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to go back home, and this weekend was especially rewarding for me. My wife and I left D.C. this past Friday afternoon, flew through Dallas, and landed in Wichita sometime shortly after sunset.

As we hopped in my truck, the snow had started to fall, and it was a beautiful Kansas evening. We got home and

got to see our two boys. I woke up the next morning early, went to Sterling, Kansas, for a business meeting, then went over to Salina and got to meet some more of my friends.

On the way home, I got to listen to the radio. I listened to a Kansas State Wildcats basketball game and heard the Wildcats win that game by 1 point. And then when I got home, a special treat: I got to watch both the Kansas University basketball team win and watch my Kansas City Chiefs win. And I got to watch those games with my two boys. So it was a trifecta for Kansas, a great day.

The next morning, I woke up early for church and went to early service, and basically had to hop in my truck and come back to D.C. that same afternoon.

On the way back to the airport, I got a little bit of time to reflect; and one of the things that had come to mind was something that my good friend, my mentor, the former majority leader, one of the longest serving majority leaders in the Senate, Senator Bob Dole, had told me.

One thing Senator Dole says every time I see him is to always remember where I am from. And I think I get that. I think most of us get it, that where we are from is so very important to us, and I have always done a good job with that.

But the other thing that he talked about—I approached him one time when we were having a tough issue here in Congress, one of the first issues I had to vote on. What he told me, rather than giving me an answer, giving me his opinion, was to go back to Kansas, and the people of Kansas would tell me what to do.

So what is ironic as I went back home for these meetings and to go to church is that, everywhere I went, I heard the same thing. I heard the same thing from people in church that I had no idea that they knew so much about what was going on in Washington.

In Salina, in Sterling, everywhere I went, people asked me: When is Congress going to give the President his money to build the border?—a very simple question. So that allowed me to kind of ponder the issue a little bit more.

I have stood beside the President since day one on this issue. When I was running for Congress, I made national security, border security the top priority on what I was going to stand for; and today, I have been to that border.

As a physician of 25 years and now a Congressman for 2 years, I would tell you this: There is, indeed, a humanitarian crisis on the border as well as a national security issue on the border. Whether it is concerning the 2,000 people who come across that border illegally every day—every night we house some 40,000 people. We give them a bed. We feed them. Every day, two tons of illegal drugs come across our borders.

Mr. Speaker, that sounds like a humanitarian crisis to me and sounds like a national security crisis to me. People then often ask me: “Well, why don’t we compromise?”

And I will tell you this. I feel like we have compromised already. The President, myself, most Republicans, we asked for \$25 billion to secure those borders and to provide humanitarian help for people.

We thought we probably needed to build 1,000, maybe 1,500 miles of border. We compromised from those numbers back to asking for just \$5.7 billion, and now we are asking for moneys to build about 234 miles of not a wall, but a barrier, a fence.

I think that that is compromise. And, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you come back to the table now and negotiate in good faith.

Mr. Speaker, people often talk that this has to be an either/or opportunity, that we either have to have border security or show compassion.

We can do both. America can do both. We can have border security, we can

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H521

provide for the humanitarian needs of people, and we can come up with a compassionate, long-term immigration process.

This system needs to be totally overhauled. I am all in. We have had several great bills that we have tried to get through.

So, Mr. Speaker, please come back to the table. Let's open up the government, and let's secure our borders.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Thank You, God, for giving us another day. Even before the first word is spoken this day, O Lord, guide our minds, thoughts, hearts, and desires.

Breathe into the Members of this House a new spirit. Shape this Congress and our world according to Your design that all might fulfill Your holy will.

Bless the Members of this assembly with attentive hearts and open minds, that through the diversity of ideas, they may sort out what is best for our Nation.

May all speech in this assembly be deliberately free of all prejudice so that others might listen wholeheartedly. Then all dialogue will be mutually respectful, surprising even us with unity and justice.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, January 11, 2019:

S. 24, to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

INVESTING IN MAIN STREET ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 116) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 116

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Investing in Main Street Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. INVESTMENT IN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

Section 302(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 682(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: "or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus";

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: "or, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, 15 percent of such capital and surplus"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appropriate Federal banking agency' has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

Since 1958, the Small Business Investment Company, SBIC, program has been an integral part of SBA's mission to provide small businesses with capital and create jobs. It achieves this purpose by partnering private and public investments in early-stage startup businesses.

In fact, in 2016, the SBIC program provided \$6 billion in financing to 1,200 small businesses and helped sustain over 120,000 jobs. It has afforded America's small businesses an invaluable opportunity to grow their innovative ideas.

Just look at Apple, Tesla, and FedEx. They have all achieved what we hope for every small business: extraordinary growth and success. And they each received early-stage financing from SBICs.

One of the SBIC program's greatest strengths is its hands-off approach, giving fund managers the autonomy to invest in almost any business sector they choose, from apparel to cutting-edge technology. This freedom, coupled with sound investment strategies, has led to its success.

Access to capital remains the number one priority for small firms across America. The SBIC program has helped increase the flow of capital to worthy small companies, yet we can do more to ensure they can meet growing demand.

H.R. 116 will strengthen and grow the SBIC program by letting banks and Federal savings associations invest up to 15 percent of their holdings into SBICs. This increase in capital, at no cost to the taxpayers, provides entrepreneurs with enhanced opportunities to grow their businesses and create jobs.

The goal of the SBIC program is to fill the gap between the availability of venture capital and the needs of small

businesses in startup and growth situations. Today's bill makes a sensible change to address this goal by facilitating increased investment in small firms.

I applaud Congresswoman CHU in identifying this issue and finding a solution. I, therefore, ask my fellow Members to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

Small businesses across the country are reporting increased confidence and heightened optimism. Despite these improving economic conditions for the Nation's true job creators, many of them are still facing hurdles when it comes to accessing capital to grow and expand their operations.

To assist small businesses with their financing needs, the SBA, Small Business Administration, offers the Small Business Investment Company program, also known as the SBIC program.

While currently running on a zero-cost subsidy to the American taxpayer, the SBIC program increases access to long-term capital through a private equity financing model. SBICs are privately owned but licensed and regulated by the SBA.

The Investing in Main Street Act of 2019 provides a simple and common-sense solution to a limitation that is holding back growth within the SBIC program.

Currently, financial institutions and savings associations are prohibited from investing more than 5 percent of capital or surplus in an SBIC. In order to assist small businesses as they seek capital, H.R. 116 increases the 5 percent limitation to 15 percent, subject to the approval of the financial institution's regulator.

In the 115th Congress, an identical bill was favorably reported out of the Small Business Committee, unanimously, and passed on the House floor via voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for continuing their work on this legislation. As always, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) the now-chairman of the Small Business Committee, for advancing this bipartisan bill that will further improve the SBIC program.

Small businesses, from Ohio to Texas to California, are transforming towns and communities across the country. They are building the Nation's newest products and offering the newest services, all while constantly innovating. They are nimble, swift, and often very flexible. We must work together to create an environment where they are free to grow and create jobs.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, the Investing in Main Street Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), author of this legislation.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act of 2019.

I am so pleased that the House is considering this bill at the very start of this new Congress because small businesses are the backbone of our economy. They account for two out of every three new jobs and lead the way in innovation.

The SBA's Small Business Investment Company, or SBIC, program is an effective tool that helps small businesses get off the ground and succeed. The program facilitates private investment into early-stage startup small businesses across the country, and all at no Federal cost.

Staples, Tesla, FedEx, Apple, Intel, and Costco are just a few examples of the thousands of small businesses that have successfully used the Small Business Investment Company program during their early stages of growth. In fact, in 2016, the SBIC program provided \$6 billion in financing to 1,200 small businesses and helped to sustain over 120,000 jobs. It has afforded America's small businesses an invaluable opportunity to grow their innovative ideas.

Now, many decades ago, the SBIC program was restricted from taking more than 5 percent of capital investments from banks due to this provision in the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. That provision is still the law. However, since then, banking regulations established by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency allow these same banks to invest up to 15 percent of their capital and surplus into SBICs.

I introduced the Investing in Main Street Act with Representative RALPH NORMAN of South Carolina to correct this discrepancy. This bipartisan bill would allow banks and Federal savings associations to invest up to 15 percent of their holdings to these funds to match current banking regulations.

This change will strengthen and grow the SBIC program, unleashing more capital to small businesses, and all at no cost to the taxpayer. That means more entrepreneurs will be able to access the capital they need to grow their businesses and hire their workers.

This legislation makes a sensible change to address the number one need of small firms accessing capital. I, therefore, ask my fellow Members to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentlewoman for working with us on this. The SBIC program invests in small firms across the country, providing them with the working capital they need to create and innovate new products and new technologies.

This bipartisan legislation passed the House, as we mentioned before, unanimously last Congress, and it removes a restriction that has hindered the growth of the SBIC program. It will allow it to grow and support more firms all across America, from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, access to capital is the lifeblood of every small business. The SBIC program fills the gap between the availability of venture capital and the needs of small businesses in startup and growth situations.

The SBIC program has long been an important way of channeling capital to leading-edge, high-growth companies. In fact, some of the Nation's most successful corporations received early-stage financing from SBICs. Without it, they may not be the companies they are today.

The key to the program's success is leveraging Federal funds to increase the amount of private capital invested in such promising startup companies. With more than \$24 billion of capital under management, the SBIC program has a proven track record of success.

Creating parity in the SBIC program by raising the investment threshold from 5 percent to 15 percent will result in significant small business investment; and like we all know, providing funds to small firms results in real growth in our local communities.

H.R. 116 has bipartisan support, and it is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. As such, I once again urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 116, the "Investing in Main Street Act of 2019."

H.R. 116 amends the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency.

Texas has, for a historical fourth time, been ranked by CNBC as the number one spot for "America's Top States for Business."

WalletHub also recognized Texas as a small business friendly state by ranking Texas as the best state to start a business overall and giving Texas first place in the business environment category which looks at average growth in number of small businesses, growth of business revenues, five-year business survival rate, and job growth, amongst other categories.

Houston alone has almost 120,000 small businesses.

This makes Houston ninth nationwide and second statewide for total number of small businesses.

These small businesses enjoy calling home the 13th friendliest city in the nation for small business owners.

Over 99 percent of the businesses in Houston are considered small.

4.0 GPA is one of the many Houston small business success stories.

Founded by Henry Keculah, Jr. in 2016, 4.0 GPA's mission is to provide all students, regardless of their socioeconomic background, with the opportunity to attend an institution of higher education.

Henry, Jr. was one of five 2018 Upstart Award Finalist.

Upstart awards recognize African-American entrepreneurs who run successful companies and also give back to their communities.

H.R. 116 is common sense legislation that supports small business like 4.0 GPA, and even the Chamber of Commerce has written in support of it.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 116.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 116.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STIMULATING INNOVATION THROUGH PROCUREMENT ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 246) to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 246

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.

Section 9(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(13) the term 'senior procurement executive' means an official designated under section 1702(c) of title 41, United States Code, as the senior procurement executive of a Federal agency participating in a SBIR or STTR program."

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVES IN SBIR AND STTR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(10) to coordinate, where appropriate, with the senior procurement executive of the relevant Federal agency to assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program with commercializing research developed under such a program before such small business concern is awarded a contract from such Federal agency."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 9(b)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(b)(3)) is amended by striking "and" at the end.

SEC. 4. MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHER ACQUISITION PERSONNEL.

(a) SBIR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(j)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) MODIFICATIONS RELATING TO PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.—Upon the enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall modify the policy directives issued pursuant to this subsection to require procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l)) to assist small business concerns participating in the SBIR program with researching solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement with the concern) and to provide technical assistance to such concerns to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract. The procurement center representatives shall coordinate with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the agency letting the contract."

(b) STTR AMENDMENT.—Section 9(p)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(p)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(G) procedures to ensure that procurement center representatives (as described in section 15(l))—

"(i) assist small business concerns participating in the STTR program with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement with the concern);

"(ii) provide technical assistance to such concerns to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract; and

"(iii) coordinate with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to section 15(k) for the Federal agency letting the contract in providing the assistance described in clause (i)."

SEC. 5. AMENDMENT TO DUTIES OF PROCUREMENT CENTER REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 15(l)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (J) as subparagraph (L); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (I) the following new subparagraphs:

"(J) assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract

to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program;

"(K) provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with the appropriate senior procurement executive and the appropriate Director of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization established pursuant to subsection (k) for the agency letting the contract; and"

SEC. 6. AMENDMENT TO THE DUTIES OF THE DIRECTOR OF SMALL AND DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS UTILIZATION FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(21) shall assist small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 with researching applicable solicitations for the award of a Federal contract (particularly with the Federal agency that has a funding agreement, as defined under section 9, with the concern) to market the research developed by such concern under such SBIR or STTR program; and

"(22) shall provide technical assistance to small business concerns participating in a SBIR or STTR program under section 9 to submit a bid for an award of a Federal contract, including coordination with procurement center representatives and the appropriate senior procurement executive for the agency letting the contract."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation Through Procurement Act of 2019.

For more than 30 years, the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, or SBIR and STTR programs as we call them, have provided a critical source of funding to small businesses that engage in research and development.

□ 1615

The result is higher rates of business formation and job creation, something we can all be proud of.

For the U.S. economy, the SBIR and STTR programs are important to employment in scientific and technical fields. Initially, companies must hire individuals to carry out the research

and development. If research is commercialized, however, sustainable jobs can be created as products are moved to market.

This ingenuity is what makes America a global economic powerhouse. Since its establishment, these programs have helped launch tens of thousands of successful research projects in a wide variety of industries. Yet, small, high-growth firms often face a disconnect when attempting to transfer their SBIR technologies to precision programs.

Today's measure, H.R. 246, bridges this gap and aids small business concerns in commercializing their technology when obtaining government contracts. Statutorily amending the role of acquisition personnel to assist companies in the SBIR and STTR programs levels the playing field for innovative businesses competing in the Federal marketplace.

Closing this gap doesn't just help our government secure the best technologies and ideas; it grows our local communities where many small SBIR- and STTR-funded firms operate.

I applaud the bipartisanship of Ms. FINKENAUER, a freshman Member of Congress, and Mr. CURTIS in their efforts to increase participation of small, innovative companies within the Federal marketplace by guaranteeing them the same assistance other small firms receive from contracting officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) for their efforts on this important legislation.

This bill continues the committee's longstanding emphasis on the commercialization of technologies developed in the Small Business Innovation Research, or SBIR program.

The bill does this by incorporating acquisition personnel into the SBIR and the Small Business Technology Transfer, STTR, programs where appropriate. Under the bill, procurement center representatives, or PCRs, would be required to coordinate and collaborate with Federal agency small business advocates and are responsible for providing small businesses with technical assistance as they navigate the bidding process. Doing so would give small firms a better understanding of the government contracting process and increases their chances of success.

The SBIR and STTR programs are often the first place innovative, small firms look in order to contract with the Federal Government. Unfortunately, it is often difficult for a firm, particularly a new firm, to understand the ins and outs of working with the Federal Government. It can be quite complex.

Providing a new avenue for counseling by utilizing the national network of PCRs will help pioneering, small firms better prepare their proposals for the SBIR and STTR programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER), the author of this legislation.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019.

My bill helps small businesses compete for government contracts and research grants and gives them the opportunity to grow and innovate.

I grew up in a small town in northeast Iowa, and I am proud to represent communities like mine in Congress. The Iowans I know want to be able to stay and build a life in the communities that raised them. I am proud to introduce legislation that will give the next generation of Iowans opportunities to innovate in our State.

Too often, small businesses, especially rural ones, get locked out of the competition for government contracts and grants. This bill ensures that agency procurement officers will be more directly involved in this process, helping small businesses pursue research that lets them compete for these opportunities.

H.R. 246 requires procurement center representatives and other contracting officials to assist small businesses in the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs. Making this a statutory mandate levels the playing field for our small businesses, ensuring they won't be at a disadvantage during the bidding process.

It means that when a small business owner in Marion or Manly, Iowa has a great idea that will create jobs in our communities, our government is actually making it easier, not harder, for them to grow and innovate. When Congress supports small businesses, it strengthens communities like mine in northeast Iowa.

I thank my colleague and cosponsor, Congressman CURTIS, and I thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for her support and leadership of innovative small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), who is our chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member CHABOT. I rise in support of H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019. I am pleased to lead as an original coauthor and thank Ms. FINKENAUER for her collaboration and effort on this important legislation.

Much of the country's success can be attributed to pioneering individuals

and small companies, folks who have discovered a problem and developed an efficient, cost-effective solution. Innovation, research, and advancement in technology are our major drivers in today's postmodern world, and it is critical that we continue promoting the development of new and advanced technologies.

I am proud that in my home State of Utah we foster a thriving tech hub and innovation marketplace where the tech industry grew last year faster than any other State in the Nation. But there is still more work to be done in Utah and across the country.

This bill reinforces my commitment to small business success by stimulating technology innovation through the Small Business Innovation Research, or SBIR program.

Through adding critical acquisition personnel into SBIR and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, this legislation will ensure these small businesses have a voice in the procurement process and can compete on a level playing field and have a chance at success. It adds zero cost to the taxpayer.

This bill is a commonsense, forward-leaning bill that protects Federal investment into innovation and technology research by small businesses and helps these innovators succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah again for his leadership on this, and thank the gentlewoman from Iowa as well, and, as always, thank the chairwoman, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

This straightforward legislation directs PCRs and senior procurement executives in agencies to assist small businesses in the SBIR and STTR programs.

Such assistance could be in the form of researching applicable solicitations, providing technical assistance when bidding for contracts, or coordinating with appropriate agency procurement officials.

The House passed identical legislation unanimously as part of a larger package last Congress, and we recommend passage of this bill again this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) for introducing today's bill to spur increased contracting activity in the SBIR and STTR programs.

The SBIR program has helped thousands of small, innovative firms with good ideas to compete for Federal research and development awards. Their

success has a proven record in a diverse range of fields, including: defense, health, energy, and technology.

H.R. 246, the Stimulating Innovation through Procurement Act of 2019, enables more SBIR and STTR businesses to reach their potential. It directs procurement center representatives and senior procurement executives in agencies to assist small business concerns in the SBIR and STTR programs, and coordinates with appropriate agency procurement officials.

This bill will open the Federal marketplace to more small, high-growth companies through increased technical assistance and advocacy, ensuring our country remains a leader in innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 246.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENCOURAGING SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION ACT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 206) to amend the small business laws to create certain requirements with respect to the SBIR and STTR program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 206

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act”.

SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF TESTING AND EVALUATION IN THE DEFINITION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

Section 9(e)(5) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(e)(5)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively (and conforming the margins accordingly);

(2) by striking “means any activity which is” and inserting the following: “means—

“(A) any activity which is—”; and

(3) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by adding “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any testing or evaluation in connection with such an activity;”.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES IN SBIR AND STTR.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended—

(1) by striking “or private equity firm investment” each place such term appears and inserting “private equity firm, or SBIC investment”;

(2) by striking “or private equity firms” and inserting “private equity firms, or SBICs”;

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (12)(B), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (13)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(14) the term ‘SBIC’ means a small business investment company as defined in section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.”; and

(4) in the heading for subsection (dd), by striking “OR PRIVATE EQUITY FIRMS” and inserting “PRIVATE EQUITY FIRMS, OR SBICs”.

SEC. 4. CALCULATION OF LEVERAGE OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES THAT INVEST IN SBIR OR STTR PARTICIPANTS.

Section 303(b)(2) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) INVESTMENTS IN SBIR AND STTR PARTICIPANTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), in calculating the outstanding leverage of a company for purposes of subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall exclude the amount of any investment made in a SBIR or STTR participant, if such investment is made in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph or any fiscal year thereafter by a company licensed during the applicable fiscal year.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS.—

“(I) AMOUNT OF EXCLUSION.—The amount excluded under clause (i) for a company shall not exceed 33 percent of the private capital of that company.

“(II) MAXIMUM INVESTMENT.—A company shall not make an investment in any one SBIR or STTR participant in an amount equal to more than 20 percent of the private capital of that company.

“(III) OTHER TERMS.—The exclusion of amounts under clause (i) shall be subject to such terms as the Administrator may impose to ensure that there is no cost (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) with respect to purchasing or guaranteeing any debt instrument involved.

“(iii) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘SBIR or STTR participant’ means a small business concern that receives contracts or grants pursuant to section 9 of the Small Business Act.”.

SEC. 5. ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION IN THE MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.

Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(tt) ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION IN THE MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.—The Administrator shall provide an increase to the past performance rating of any small business concern that has participated in the SBIR or STTR program that serves as a mentor under section 45 to a small business concern that seeks to participate in the SBIR or STTR program.”.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL MEETING FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES WITH A SBIR OR STTR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(uu) ANNUAL MEETING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal agency required to have a program under this section (or a designee) and the Administrator (or a designee) shall meet annually to discuss methods—

“(A) to improve the collection of data under this section;

“(B) to improve the reporting of data to the Administrator under this section;

“(C) to make the application processes for programs under this section more efficient; and

“(D) to increase participation in the programs under this section.

“(2) REPORTING.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which an annual meeting required under paragraph (1) is held, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, a report on the findings of such meeting and recommendations on how to implement changes to programs under this section.”.

(b) FUNDING FOR ANNUAL MEETING.—Section 9(mm)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking the “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) the annual meeting required under subsection (uu).”.

SEC. 7. INCREASING PARTICIPATION OF UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS IN THE SBIR AND STTR PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 9(mm)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) OUTREACH AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—A Federal agency participating in the program under this subsection shall use a portion of the funds authorized for uses under paragraph (1) to carry out the policy directive required under subsection (j)(2)(F) and to increase the participation of States with respect to which a low level of SBIR awards have historically been awarded.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9(mm)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638(mm)(6)) is amended by striking “paragraph (2)(A) and any use of the waiver authority under paragraph (2)(B)” and inserting “paragraph (2)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act of 2019. For almost 40 years, our Nation has experienced increased innovation and job creation through the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program.

As a direct result of these programs, breakthroughs have been made in a wide range of sectors, from agriculture,

to energy, and most notably, healthcare. Research conducted by SBIR and STTR awardees has helped address our country's most important technological and research-based challenges while generating tremendous economic growth and employment opportunities.

These programs encourage small firms, where much of today's cutting-edge ideas are born, to explore their potential while also providing the incentive to profit from its commercialization.

Yet, as with any program, improvements can be made to further strengthen the program and its impact on our economy.

By incentivizing more experienced SBIR and STTR firms to mentor newer companies and rewarding mentors through a past-performance rating increase, Congressman ROUDA's legislation, H.R. 206, positively promotes integrating these program participants into the larger Federal marketplace.

Just as we are concerned with the broader ability of SBIR and STTR firms to compete more broadly, it is important to ensure the participation of all businesses within the program. Just like with geography, when it comes to demographics, it is important that the SBIR and STTR are serving all entrepreneurs.

This measure requires participating agencies to use part of their SBIR allocation to conduct outreach to minorities and underrepresented States by removing the waiver of this requirement from the statute. Doing so, guarantees that a wide range of ideas are provided the opportunity to thrive.

□ 1630

Finally, H.R. 206 requires an annual summit of these agencies to share best practices to improve data collection and streamline processes across the programs. As a result, I believe this bill is crucial to modernizing the program and preserving our Nation's competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act.

I want to commend Mr. ROUDA on his work to improve the Small Business Innovation Research program and the Small Business Technology Transfer program, or SBIR and STTR as they are more commonly known.

These critical programs provide exceptionally innovative small firms with the kick-start they need to develop the next big thing and turn their companies from small businesses into large ones. These innovations have saved lives on the battlefield, in the hospital room, and made immeasurable advancements in communication technology and countless other improvements to technologies we all use on a daily basis.

Among other things, this straightforward bill updates and harmonizes the definition of research and development in the Small Business Act, providing an avenue for more experienced SBIR companies to mentor newer companies, and improves oversight.

Furthermore, this bill encourages collaboration and sharing of best practices among Federal agencies to enhance the efficacy of the SBIR and STTR programs. Federal agencies housing these programs would be required to meet annually to discuss potential data collection and reporting process improvements, ideas to increase small business participation, and will be required to update Congress on the outcomes and recommendations arising from these meetings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA), who is the author of this bill.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act.

The Small Business Innovation Research program, or SBIR, and the Small Business Technology Transfer program, or STTR, were established to spur innovation and job creation throughout the country. Since their inception, these programs have awarded over \$40 billion to small innovative firms, including \$34 million in California's 48th District. Together, these programs are some of the Federal Government's largest technology development programs.

For many research companies in my district and around the country, these two programs serve as a gateway to the Federal contracting field. The continued success of these programs depends on three primary factors:

First, the program must remain highly competitive;

Second, applicants and awardees must have access to financing of all types, including venture capital;

Third, we must ensure these products make it to the market.

But the lack of competitiveness and diversity continue to raise questions, with the participation of women-owned and minority-owned firms in these programs declining.

According to the Small Business Administration's annual report for fiscal year 2013, only 15 percent of total award dollars went to women-owned small businesses, and only 10 percent to socially or economically disadvantaged small and HUBZone-certified small businesses.

This bill addresses both issues by requiring participating agencies to use part of their SBIR allocation to conduct outreach to minorities and underrepresented States by removing the waiver of this requirement from statute.

To address the need for outside financing, this bill includes small busi-

ness investment companies in the SBIR and STTR programs as possible investors and increases the capital levels that can be invested by private investors.

Finally, H.R. 206 also provides an avenue for more experienced SBIR and STTR companies to mentor newer companies. It is clear that the SBIR and STTR programs have promoted our shared goal of fostering innovation, but we must continue to provide vigilant oversight of these programs to ensure their maximum effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the Small Business Investor Alliance.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTOR ALLIANCE,
January 14, 2019.

Hon. HARLEY ROUDA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROUDA: Since 1958, the Small Business Investor Alliance (SBIA) has been the voice of Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs). We write in support of H.R. 206, the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act, which is being considered by the House of Representatives today. The bill is a simple, modest improvement to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 that would encourage more investment in job-creating American small businesses.

SBICs are highly-regulated private funds that invest exclusively in domestic small businesses, with at least 25% of their investments in even smaller enterprises. The nearly \$28 billion SBIC debenture program is a market-driven platform that serves an important public purpose of facilitating private investment in domestic small businesses. After raising private capital and successfully navigating a rigorous licensing process, a licensed SBIC is permitted to access a line of credit (leverage) to increase the amount of capital to be invested in domestic small businesses. Generally, the ratio of leverage to private capital is a little less than 2:1, with some strategies utilizing an even lower leverage ratio. With the private capital in a first-loss position, a modest leverage ratio, and the benefits of the portfolio effect, the program operates by law at zero subsidy, further exhibiting effective protection for the American taxpayer. As a testament to the underlying structure of the SBIC program, it is one of the few government programs that was able to continue to operate at zero subsidy through the Great Recession.

H.R. 206 seeks to encourage more investment in Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) companies. The stated mission of the SBIR and STTR programs is to "support scientific excellence and technological innovation through the investment of Federal research funds in critical American priorities to build a strong national economy." Both programs seek to increase private sector commercialization of innovations arising out of federal research and development. H.R. 206 would include SBICs in SBIR and STTR and would allow SBICs to exclude a percentage of their SBIR and STTR investments from their leverage calculation, with the goal of spurring more investment in technology and innovation.

H.R. 206 would make thoughtful improvements to the SBIC program and thereby help domestic small businesses. SBIA thanks you for your leadership on this legislation and for your commitment to expanding economic opportunity in America. We look forward to working with you during the 116th Congress

to continue strengthening the SBIC program.

Sincerely,

BRETT PALMER,

President, Small Business Investor Alliance.

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for her support and leadership of innovative small business. I also want to thank Representative ESPAILLAT for his work on this issue in the last Congress, and I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the SBIR and STTR programs are often the first place small innovative companies come to do business with the Federal Government. They are widely popular here on Capitol Hill, in the administration, and in the industrial base as well. They provide that initial kick-start of funding for ideas that could change the world, literally, for the better.

Mr. Speaker, the reforms contained in H.R. 206 make it easier for those ideas to become a reality. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) for introducing today's bill to increase the assistance to SBIR and STTR firms.

Since their inception, over \$40 billion in awards have been made, proving their success as a funding source for small innovative firms.

As we have done before, we must ensure the longevity of the program by guaranteeing it reflects modern R&D practices. It must also optimize participation through mentorship incentives and Phase 3 awards, in addition to including small business investment companies in the SBIR and STTR programs to stimulate investment.

This bill achieves this goal and guarantees the program meets the needs of our next generation of SBIR and STTR firms. H.R. 206 makes certain that the program remains a catalyst for not just innovation, but also the economic empowerment and job creation that is associated with these scientific advances.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the new Chair of the House Small Business Committee Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ for her leadership on this issue and for working with me during the 115th Congress when the Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act first passed in the House. I also want to congratulate Congressman ROUDA on his success in moving this issue forward in the 116th Congress and thank him for his commitment to spur innovation and address the issue of underrepresentation of minorities in the small business community.

The Encouraging Small Business Innovation Act is thoughtful and constructive legislation.

Even in this modern day, we have heard from many minority and women-owned small businesses that they continue to face institutional challenges to growing their businesses. A 2013 report commissioned by the Small Business Administration found that women-owned small businesses do not have equal access to capital from the private sector as compared to their male peers. Furthermore, the Small Business Administration's own Office of Advocacy has said that, "There are fewer minority-owned businesses representing high-patenting industries than in all industries."

Through the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs, the Small Business Administration works with partners in eleven federal agencies ranging from the Department of Agriculture to NASA to support small businesses, especially those that are owned by members of identified disadvantaged communities. While these programs have made some headway in encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship among women and many minority communities, this vital investment can only be used for research and development. There is no consideration given for testing and evaluation, an extremely resource-heavy task for small businesses. What good is a product or a method when you don't know if it works effectively or efficiently? The Small Business Innovation Act addresses this problem by including "testing" and "evaluation" among the activities for which SBIR and STTR applicants can seek funding. This will empower more underrepresented entrepreneurs to develop new products, expand upon new ideas, and gain respected external validators.

The Small Business Innovation Act also includes a number of other provisions that I believe will significantly help expand entrepreneurship in underserved communities. For example, the bill incentivizes mentorship with previous SBIR- and STTR-recipient companies that have found success in the programs to impart their knowledge and share their experience. It also welcomes investment by Small Business Investment Companies into SBIR and STTR projects, which will increase the investment of capital from more diverse streams of funding. The bill also prioritizes data collection and reporting, ensuring that evaluation of the program leads to increased efficiency and additional participation. Finally, and most importantly, the bill makes explicit commitments to increasing the participation of underserved populations in the small business community.

So again, I thank my colleague, Mr. ROUDA, and Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for taking up this important cause and I congratulate them both on a job well done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 206.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 14, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 14, 2019, at 3:19 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of the Honorable John Chester Culver, former United States Senator for the State of Iowa S. Res. 16

Appointments:

Syria Study Group

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control for the 116th Congress

United States—China Economic and Security Review Commission

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

EXPANDING CONTRACTING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES ACT OF 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 190) to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate the inclusion of option years in the award price for sole source contracts, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 190

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO CONTRACTING AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

(a) QUALIFIED HUBZONE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 31(b)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657a(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS.—A contracting officer may award sole source contracts under this section to any qualified HUBZone small business concern, if—

"(i) the qualified HUBZone small business concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of such contract opportunity;

"(ii) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more qualified HUBZone small business concerns will submit offers for the contracting opportunity;

"(iii) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

"(I) \$7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

"(II) \$4,000,000, in the case of all other contract opportunities; and

"(iv) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price."

(b) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.—Subsection (a) of section 36 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657f) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS.—In accordance with this section, a contracting officer

may award a sole source contract to any small business concern owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans if—

“(1) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of such contract opportunity;

“(2) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans will submit offers for the contracting opportunity;

“(3) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

“(A) \$7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

“(B) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

“(4) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

“(5) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

“(6) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.”.

(c) **CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.**—Section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (7) to read as follows:

“(7) **AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN.**—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women described in paragraph (2)(A) and certified under paragraph (2)(E) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(B) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more businesses described in paragraph (2)(A) will submit offers;

“(C) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

“(i) \$7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

“(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

“(E) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

“(F) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8) **AUTHORITY FOR SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY WOMEN IN SUBSTANTIALLY UNDERREPRESENTED INDUSTRIES.**—A contracting officer may award a sole source contract under this subsection to any small business concern owned and controlled by women certified under paragraph (2)(E) that is in an industry in which small business concerns owned and controlled by women are substantially underrepresented (as determined by the Administrator under paragraph (3)) if—

“(A) such concern is determined to be a responsible contractor with respect to performance of the contract opportunity;

“(B) the contracting officer does not have a reasonable expectation that two or more businesses in an industry that has received a

waiver under paragraph (3) will submit offers;

“(C) the anticipated award price of the contract will not exceed—

“(i) \$7,000,000, in the case of a contract opportunity assigned a standard industrial classification code for manufacturing; or

“(ii) \$4,000,000, in the case of any other contract opportunity;

“(D) in the estimation of the contracting officer, the contract award can be made at a fair and reasonable price;

“(E) the contracting officer has notified the Administration of the intent to make such award and requested that the Administration determine the concern's eligibility for award; and

“(F) the Administration has determined that such concern is eligible for award.”.

(d) **ELIMINATION OF THE INCLUSION OF OPTION YEARS IN THE AWARD PRICE FOR CONTRACTS.**—Section 8 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637) is amended by striking “(including options)” each place such term appears.

SEC. 3. SBA CERTIFICATION PROGRAM NOTIFICATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall notify the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate when the Administrator has implemented each of the following:

(1) A program to certify small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as defined in section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))).

(2) A program to certify small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as defined in section 3(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q))).

(b) **ADDITIONAL NOTICE.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit a copy of a notification required under subsection (a) to the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives so that the Law Revision Counsel may execute the amendments required under section 4.

SEC. 4. REMOVAL OF ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION UPON IMPLEMENTATION OF CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

Effective upon the notification described under section 3, the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 8(m)—

(A) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F); and

(B) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F); and

(2) in section 36(a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by adding “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6).

SEC. 5. GAO REPORT.

(a) **STUDY.**—With respect to the procurement programs of the Small Business Administration for small business concerns owned and controlled by women (as defined in section 8(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(m))) and for small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans (as defined in section 3(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q))), the Comptroller General of the United States

shall conduct an evaluation of the policies and practices used by the Administration and other Federal agencies to provide assurances that contracting officers are properly classifying sole source awards under those programs in the Federal Procurement Data System and that sole source contracts awarded under those programs are being awarded to eligible concerns.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the Small Business Administration implements the certification programs described under section 3, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate containing the findings made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

(c) **SBA CONSIDERATION OF GAO REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall review the report issued under subsection (b) and take such actions as the Administrator may determine appropriate to address any concerns raised in such report and any recommendations contained in such report.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—After the review described under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall issue a report to Congress—

(A) stating that no additional actions were necessary to address any concerns or recommendations contained in the report; or

(B) describing the actions taken by the Administrator to resolve such concerns or implement such recommendations.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

The Small Businesses Act sets forth a governmentwide 23 percent goal of Federal contracts that should be awarded to small businesses. Each Federal agency is charged with setting its own small business goals, which are to reflect the maximum possible opportunity for small business within that agency.

Regrettably, small firms face barriers in securing Federal contracts. According to the SBA, small businesses won \$105.6 billion in contracts during fiscal year 2016, representing 23.88 percent of total Federal contract dollars. That is why the Small Business Act gives agencies the ability to limit, or set aside, contracts for small businesses to bid and compete against one another.

The SBA administers several set-asides that are designed to increase the participation of several socioeconomic categories, including the 8(a) program, HUBZone program, women-owned, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business programs.

While most contracts are awarded through competition, sole source contracts also exist if certain criteria are met. However, current sole source awards have become complex and underutilized in recent years. They do not represent the changing nature of Federal contract awards and have become outdated. H.R. 190 raises the dollar amount of sole source awards to reflect modern contract awards.

I applaud Mr. MARSHALL and his cosponsor, Mr. SCHNEIDER, for introducing this bill providing flexibility to contracting officers when awarding sole source contracts under SBA contracting programs.

By promoting the use of sole source contracts to small businesses, this bill adds to the government's pool of suppliers. This results in higher quality goods and increased job creation for the economy, as these direct awards require the small business to do the majority of the work and not subcontract out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner on this important legislation.

The bill we are considering today passed the House last September because it is both good for small businesses and good for the Federal Government. By raising the potential amount of sole source contract awards, this bill encourages Federal agency contracting officers to do more work with women-owned, service-disabled veteran-owned, HUBZone, and socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses.

The bill will also strengthen the integrity of the sole source award process by requiring the SBA to actively determine that a women-owned or service-disabled veteran-owned small business is qualified and eligible to receive the award before it is made.

Finally, the bill tasks the Government Accountability Office with assessing Congress' ability to oversee proper spending through sole source awards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who is a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019. I am proud to again introduce this bill with my friend from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

As they did in the last Congress, I encourage my colleagues to join us in passing this important bipartisan legislation.

Women-owned businesses, companies owned by service-disabled veterans, and other types of small firms have unique opportunities to work with the Federal Government through sole source contracting.

Unfortunately, regulations governing these types of contracts, specifically the maximum value amount of the contract, have not kept pace with inflation, and many small business owners often won't pursue these opportunities due to their diminished return. Furthermore, the law includes option years towards the cap, reducing the projected returns and lowering the appeal of sole source contracts.

For these reasons, many eligible small businesses overlook sole source contracts as a quality opportunity to do business with the Federal Government. Our bill would bring the sole source contracting requirements in line with inflation and only apply base years, not the option years, to a contract's cap.

Additionally, programs such as sole source contracting currently depend on small businesses certifying their own eligibility. It is important that we better ensure the integrity of these programs.

H.R. 190 protects these programs through a process whereby the Small Business Administration would confirm eligibility of a participating company. Sole source contractors should present a real opportunity for eligible small businesses. Our legislation would make these contracts more competitive, while enhancing how we ensure they are awarded to eligible companies.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have introduced this bipartisan legislation with Dr. MARSHALL to help small businesses, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

□ 1645

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), one of the chief sponsors of the legislation.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 190, the Expanding Contracting Opportunities for Small Businesses Act of 2019.

Small business sole source contracting can be a valuable tool for both Federal agencies and small businesses. However, our Federal procurement processes are rapidly changing, and the sole source authority provided by the Small Business Act has not kept up with these changes. By adjusting the

dollar amount thresholds for these contracts, this bill will increase the opportunities available to certain small businesses utilizing the Federal procurement process.

While it is critical that agencies maximize opportunities to small businesses, it is equally important that they have clear guidelines to guarantee only eligible and qualified firms receive the awards. This bill will apply new oversight procedure that requires agencies to coordinate with the SBA to ensure only eligible candidates are awarded a sole source contract.

I am proud of this legislation and its mission to promote small business growth, strengthen oversight, and incentivize Federal agencies to work with small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague Congressman SCHNEIDER for teaming up with us on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill as well.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I have no further speakers.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Dr. MARSHALL as well as Mr. SCHNEIDER for their work and their leadership on this important legislation.

This bill brings the dollar amount of sole source awards in line with the size of current contracts and strengthens oversight by instituting a new eligibility determination check by the SBA before sole source contracts are awarded.

Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas as well as the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this important legislation to provide flexibility to contracting officers when awarding sole source contracts.

H.R. 190 promotes the use of sole source contracts to small business concerns through the SBA contracting programs by raising the dollar threshold of these contract types to account for inflation.

It promotes and preserves a strong, competitive marketplace for our Federal agencies while also strengthening the ability of women, service-disabled veterans, and socioeconomic businesses to participate with the single largest purchaser of goods and services in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 190.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TANF EXTENSION ACT OF 2019

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 430) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through June 30, 2019.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “TANF Extension Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES PROGRAM AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH JUNE 30, 2019.

Activities authorized by part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act shall continue through June 30, 2019, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2018, and out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary for such purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation would extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, known as TANF, and the Child Care Entitlement to States, or CCES, through June 30, 2019.

Due to the stalemate in budget negotiations, TANF and CCES funding lapsed at the end of 2018. Enacting this legislation will allow the Department of Health and Human Services to send States, Tribes, and territories TANF and CCES grants for the second quarter of the fiscal year, which are now late, and to make on-time payments to States for the third quarter.

States depend on Federal TANF and childcare funding to help level the playing field for struggling parents try-

ing to work and support their families. These grants help pay for important programs such as childcare, transportation, and job training. Funds are also used to help cover basic necessities like food, housing, and diapers.

Right now, our failure to pay for what was promised is hurting State budgets, and pretty soon it will begin to affect family budgets as well.

CalWORKs, as my home State of California calls its TANF program, provides help to over 50 percent of poor children in California, which is over 1 million children, but California has a very small reserve of unspent Federal TANF funds to cover the Federal lapse in payment.

Our reserve is about the level of Federal funding the State will use in just over 2 weeks of operating CalWORKs.

California's counties are currently implementing the changes to CalWORKs that we hope will make it even more effective in stabilizing families and lifting them out of poverty. Disrupted Federal funding would make achieving that goal much harder.

We need to do far more to help children and families, and States need more stability and certainty to operate their programs. This is why the first bill that was passed in this new Congress to reopen the government included provisions to extend TANF and childcare for 2 years.

This bill would also have provided Congress with new data on beneficiary sanctions, employment, and poverty outcomes. Unfortunately, the Senate has refused to take up that bill, leaving our government in a partial shutdown and causing Federal funds for TANF and CCES to lapse, as well as payments to the States.

In the meantime, as the two Chambers continue discussions, this legislation will allow us to quickly restore payments and ensure that families who rely on TANF and childcare assistance are not collateral damage in the Trump shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019, which will end the lapse in the TANF program.

For my home State of Missouri, and specifically my district, temporary assistance is a vital lifeline of resources for families. I represent one of the most economically distressed regions in the country and the poorest congressional district in Missouri. In my State, more than 20,000 people and nearly 10,000 families currently rely on TANF.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reauthorize this program. Since TANF was created in 1996, funding for the program had never lapsed like this, until now. Federal funding of TANF has now lapsed for 2 full weeks.

TANF has never been tied to a border security debate before, and it shouldn't be now. Mr. Speaker, 20,000 people in Missouri need TANF for a hand up to get out of poverty and back to work.

Tax reform created a roaring economy, but our job is not done. Americans are no longer asking “Where are the jobs?” Instead, employers are asking “Where are the workers?”

When I meet with farmers and small business owners in southern Missouri, they tell me they desperately need more workers.

We have an economy that is built for growth, but millions of Americans are on the sidelines. That is why we need the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program to refocus on the outcome of work.

I hope that, during the 6-month extension provided by this bill, my friends on the other side of the aisle will work with us to improve the focus of TANF on outcomes so we can stop only measuring the process. Let's work together to build on the efforts from last Congress so we can help families become self-sufficient through work.

There is pride in work, and a job is the best way out of poverty. When individuals and parents work full-time, the poverty rate drops to just 3 percent.

American taxpayers contribute billions of dollars every year to support those who are in need. It is our responsibility to ensure taxpayer dollars are being used in the most effective way possible. That is why we must reauthorize this program immediately and why I have pushed for reforms.

House Republicans want every person on TANF who is work eligible to have an individual plan for how to get back into the workforce. The new goal isn't to get someone into a job for 2 weeks. The new goal is to get them into a job and keep them there so they can start their career and build a better life.

That means we want to surround Americans with more support to allow them to build their lives, like childcare and transportation. That is what we will continue to push for as we work on a longer extension.

What has become clear is that we can do a lot better to address the needs of those struggling to get ahead. With this bill, we renew the program and set the stage to make additional reforms we know are needed to expand the opportunity so that everyone can benefit from strong economic growth.

Reforming TANF to improve the lives of more American families must be our priority, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to complete this reauthorization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 430, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), an incredible advocate for those in need.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague from Missouri in asking my colleagues to support H.R. 430 and to vote "yes" on this legislation.

Now, this is just a short-term, 6-month extension of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program because we could not sign off on the negotiated 2-year extension from the omnibus. Therefore, the program has lapsed, and it is imperative that we move this legislation quickly, get it cleared through the House, sent over to the Senate, and signed into law.

Needy Americans are relying on us to do this. There are several States that have absolutely no TANF dollars, zero carryover funds to insulate against the prospect that this reckless shutdown will persist and impact our most vulnerable citizens.

While my State is not one of the 23 States that have less than one quarter of Federal TANF funding in reserve, our reserve is not gigantic. At the current spend-down rate of funds in Wisconsin, we are projecting that these funds will only last until early May, so this is of some urgency.

Just let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, about the importance of extending this program. This bill will allow HHS to send States, Tribes, and territories overdue funds that they depend upon to help level the playing field for struggling parents trying to work and to support their families, tools like childcare assistance, transportation, job training, money for basic needs, and services like food and diapers.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that three-fourths of current TANF recipients are children, usually living in poverty with their parents or grandparents.

Mr. Speaker, as a former welfare recipient who rose out of poverty with the help of cash assistance, SNAP, and higher education, I understand how critically necessary it is for Americans to have access to our Nation's safety net known as TANF.

Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the spring of 1996, when Wisconsin Governor Tommy G. Thompson decided to end welfare as we knew it.

□ 1700

I was a State senator at the time. I stood on the floor and filibustered until the wee hours of the morning with 100 amendments. Then in the fall of 1996—it was a gigantic error of judgment, in my estimation—Congress, on a bipartisan basis, followed Governor Thompson's lead and replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children with TANF, a program that turned into a block grant, having absolutely no connection with people's ability to get work.

It imposed work requirements, whether there was any viable work there or not. It limited educational opportunity for women, thus creating a permanent underclass of workers. It does not provide promised childcare and training, the very things that are most helpful for helping people get employed.

While this proposal has been adopted by Congress and signed into law, I have known, since 1996, that I would spend the rest of my career trying to right-size this program and make sure that the program not only met people's basic survival-level needs but actually worked toward helping people lift out of poverty.

I am looking forward to this 116th Congress, when we can reenvision welfare reform, because this imperfect program needs to continue to assist struggling families to meet those basic needs. Forty-three million Americans currently live in poverty and some in extreme poverty.

I remind the Speaker that our Nation is only as strong as its most vulnerable population. Instead of criminalizing welfare recipients and creating more barriers for the poor, we must help lift them up so that they, too, can escape poverty, join the economy, and add to our tax base.

Let's pass this bill, and let's use the next 6 months provided by this legislation to work together to enact long-overdue changes to TANF that will restore childcare, incentivize education, and move away from punitive time limits.

I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 430, and then I urge them to join me in reenvisioning the program.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate we are here today, actually, but I do intend to support this short-term TANF extension.

I think it is useful to understand how we got here, because it certainly informs where we should be going. While the economy is expanding at greater than 3 percent, and the unemployment rate is now below 4 percent, we know not everyone is benefiting.

There are an estimated 67 million working-age American men missing from the labor force and 5½ million youth not in school or not working. This, combined with a generation of retiring workers, has left employers desperate to fill open jobs.

Our committee held a series of hearings last spring to learn how Congress can help close the jobs gap, the difference between what employers need to keep the economy growing and the number of workers in the labor force.

We heard from employers across the country and across industries—technology in Colorado, manufacturing in Indiana and Ohio, auto plants in Michigan, homebuilders in Arizona, and the aerospace industry in Kansas. They all expressed the same message: We are hiring, and if you are not already proficient, we will pay you while you learn to do the work.

In my own district, the need for workers is a common theme among employers. One employer I spoke with recently, whose facility is largely automated, told me his biggest impediment to growth is a lack of people to run and operate the machinery.

In addition to the needs of employers and our economy, we also heard about the dignity of work from the individuals reconnected to the workforce, whether recently out of poverty or even prison. We heard how these men and women were better able to provide for their families and engage with their communities because of the social and monetary support their efforts to advance in the workforce provided. We want everyone to have that opportunity.

TANF has an important role to play in addressing the labor shortage, and changes are needed to fit the program to today's economy. More than 20 years after TANF was created, the program is not living up to expectations, and many States have lost sight of what it was intended to do: provide short-term support while people get back into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work we did in the House last year. We held seven hearings, including a legislative hearing, and we marked up legislation aimed at improving the program. Many of the proposals in our bill, the JOBS for Success Act, were supported by both parties' witnesses as well: one-on-one casework; measuring outcomes; refocusing the program on those most in need of assistance; and ensuring States could use their resources to both help people get to work, and, just as importantly, stay in the workforce and succeed.

Unfortunately, no one in the Senate took action on TANF until late last year. When they finally did deliver a proposal, it merely doubled down on, or attempted to paper over, the ongoing problems of TANF, which discourage States from helping their beneficiaries, rather than making a serious effort to help reconnect the population most in need.

Important progress has been made, both since 1996 and in the past year, but we are not done. I encourage my colleagues to support this extension and to continue working to refocus TANF to improve the lives of millions of American families.

More importantly, once this bill is signed, I encourage everyone, House and Senate, to come together and work with us to achieve solutions that help to connect Americans on the sidelines of the economy with the employers who desperately need them and to stay in the workforce long term.

We all know a check from the government is not the way out of poverty. Getting into and advancing in the workforce is.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 430, the TANF Extension Act of 2019, which extends the authorization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, TANF,

program through June 30, while we finish up our work on a long-term extension.

Our safety net is essential to helping people who fall on hard times get back up on their feet, but, too often, it becomes a web that traps people in the cycle of poverty. One of the keys to breaking that cycle is human interaction, rather than treating people and recipients like another number on a government spreadsheet.

It takes people on the front lines of the fight against poverty to make sure we are looking at the root causes of the problem and actually doing something to help people across the country build out and up on the economic ladder out of poverty. Those in the trenches fighting poverty need the flexibility to develop innovative solutions tailored to local needs that will empower individuals to move to work and to achieve the American Dream.

Over these next couple of months, we have a great opportunity to work together on a long-term extension of TANF that makes commonsense reforms to the program to ensure no one gets left behind on the sidelines.

Right now, the status quo is not working. But by focusing on workforce development, measuring work outcomes, and requiring States to engage with recipients at an individual level, we can and we will move people out of poverty, off TANF, and onto the road to success.

I thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for their work on this issue. I look forward to working with them and my other colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee on a multiyear TANF extension.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard today, there is more that can be and should be done to address the needs of those struggling to get ahead. With this bill, we secure the additional time to reform and make the changes we know are needed to expand opportunity and help more families move ahead.

We have made considerable progress identifying the challenges and the solutions, but now we need to finish our work. Let's pass this extension and work together to complete this reauthorization for the people we serve.

Again, I urge support of H.R. 430, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this simple bipartisan legislation to allow us to meet our commitments to State governments and to families in need across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 430,

the "TANF Extension Act of 2019," which extends the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program and related programs.

The bill authorizes activities outlined in part A of title IV and section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act to continue through June 30, 2019, in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2018.

This extension is necessary so society's most vulnerable do not fall through the cracks.

The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program provides critical funding to states' anti-poverty efforts.

It helps ensure that families in poverty with children can meet their children's basic needs.

The TANF program, which is time limited, assists families with children when the parents or other responsible relatives cannot provide for the family's basic needs.

The Federal government provides grants to States to run the TANF program.

These State TANF programs are designed to accomplish four goals:

To provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives;

To end the dependency of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage;

To prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies; and

To encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

States have broad flexibility to carry out their programs.

The States, not the Federal government, decide on the design of the program, the type and amount of assistance payments, the range of other services to be provided, and the rules for determining who is eligible for benefits.

These social safety net programs provide necessary government assistance to help Americans families maintain a basic standard of living, and are a safety net for the poorest of the poor.

Millions of Americans, despite working two jobs, depend on these programs just to keep food on the table and a roof over their heads for their families.

In addition, the vast majority of full-time workers live paycheck to paycheck.

In fact, 70 percent of Americans rely on at least one means tested federal program throughout their lives.

America, one of the richest countries in the world, should be able to help families caught in, to use the celebrated LBJ biographer Robert Caro's famous phrase, the "tentacles of circumstance."

However, we have an Administration that is sensitive to the plight of every day Americans.

This Administration seeks to implement an agenda that reveals a patently racist and inaccurate portrayal of poor people as lazy "Welfare Queens" who would rather depend on the government than pull themselves up by their bootstraps, but nothing could be further from the reality that millions of Americans face.

Mr. Speaker, the President should know that it is unreasonable and it is cruel to expect the poorest people to pull themselves up by their bootstraps when they do not have boots.

Our nation's social safety net programs already fail to help all of the families in need:

Only 1 in 4 poor families with children receive TANF;

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) only provides \$1.40/per meal; and

Housing assistance reaches just 1 in 5 eligible families.

That is because the federal government has failed to raise the minimum wage in almost a decade, so even if you work a full-time minimum wage job, you are still living in poverty.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here to tell the American people, do not be fooled.

Donald Trump says this is about a "poverty trap," but the real trap is not raising the minimum wage.

Employers should be highly motivated to pay their employees a fair amount so that every American can enjoy the opportunity to live with dignity, with proper nutrition and proper health care.

A salary that is not commensurate with the current cost of living prevents people from enjoying life with dignity, and that is NOT what the American dream is about.

The President opposes increasing the minimum wage and eliminating labor protections for middle and lower income workers in the African American community.

Mr. Speaker, raising the minimum wage to just \$12 per hour would save \$53 billion in SNAP benefits alone.

Wage gaps are larger today than they were in 1979.

For example, African American men's average hourly wages were 22.2 percent lower than those of white men in 1979 and declined to 31 percent lower by 2015.

Young African American women have been hardest hit since 2000.

Average wealth for white families is seven times higher than average wealth for African American families.

Worse still, median white wealth (wealth for the family in the exact middle of the overall distribution) is twelve times higher than median African American wealth.

Wage gaps are growing primarily because of discrimination and racial differences in skills and worker characteristics.

Declining unionization has also had a role in the growing black-white wage gap, particularly for men newly joining the workforce.

African Americans have been disproportionately affected by the growing gap between pay and productivity.

Not only are the President's policies divisive along racial and cultural lines, they also serve to further increase economic inequality due to their clear design in favor of the wealthiest among us at the expense of everyone else.

Trump's billionaire tax heist robs the U.S. Treasury of \$1.5 trillion in resources that could be invested in economic growth in underserved communities.

The President has proposed doubling down on the war on drugs, which drains the African American labor pool.

The President has taken every opportunity to harm health care for African-Americans from sabotaging the American Care Act to ending Medicaid as we know it.

Trump also wants you to believe that he wants a bipartisan infrastructure plan.

Do not be fooled.

Trump's review of "welfare programs" is an immoral attempt to gut the programs that provide a basic standard of living for Americans struggling to make ends meet, all to pay for

massive tax cuts to himself and the richest 1 percent.

Instead, he should raise wages and invest in job training programs to prepare Americans for the work of the future.

Mr. Speaker, our nation still has a long way to go before we achieve economic equality for all its citizens.

The President and Congressional Republicans should work with Democrats to put more money in the pockets of hardworking Americans.

At the end of the day, our constituents should be able to support their children with one full-time job.

Ultimately, we need to give families the tools they need to rise out of poverty, not undercut programs that keep them afloat.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 430.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIREN) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

INVESTING IN MAIN STREET ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 116) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—403

Abraham	Aderholt	Allen
Adams	Aguilar	Allred

Armstrong	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)	Roe, David P.	Smith (NE)	Underwood
Arrington	F.	Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Axne	Duffy	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)	Van Drew
Babin	Dunn	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)	Smucker	Vargas
Bacon	Emmer	Lamb	Rose (NY)	Soto	Veasey
Balderson	Engel	Lamborn	Rose, John W.	Spanberger	Vela
Banks	Escobar	Langevin	Rouda	Spano	Velázquez
Barr	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rouzer	Speier	Visclosky
Barragán	Españillat	Larson (CT)	Roy	Stanton	Wagner
Bass	Estes	Latta	Roybal-Allard	Stauber	Walberg
Beatty	Evans	Lawrence	Ruiz	Stefanik	Walden
Bera	Ferguson	Lawson (FL)	Ruppersberger	Steil	Walker
Bergman	Pinkenauer	Lee (CA)	Rush	Steube	Walorski
Beyer	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)	Rutherford	Stevens	Waltz
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lesko	Ryan	Stewart	Wasserman
Bishop (UT)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)	Sánchez	Stivers	Schultz
Blumenauer	Flores	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes	Suozzi	Waters
Blunt Rochester	Portenberry	Lieu, Ted	Scalise	Swalwell (CA)	Watkins
Bonamici	Foster	Loeback	Scanlon	Takano	Watson Coleman
Bost	Fox (NC)	Lofgren	Schakowsky	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel	Long	Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Welch
F.	Fudge	Lowenthal	Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Wenstrup
Brady	Fulcher	Lowey	Schrader	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Brindisi	Gabbard	Lucas	Schrier	Thornberry	Wexton
Brooks (AL)	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Schweikert	Timmons	Wild
Brooks (IN)	Gallagher	Lujan	Scott (VA)	Tipton	Williams
Brown (MD)	Gallego	Luria	Scott, David	Titus	Wilson (SC)
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Lynch	Serrano	Tlaib	Wittman
Buchanan	García (IL)	Malinowski	Shalala	Tonko	Womack
Buck	García (TX)	Maloney,	Sherman	Torres (CA)	Woodall
Bucshon	Gianforte	Carolyn B.	Sherrill	Torres Small	Wright
Budd	Gohmert	Maloney, Sean	Simpson	(NM)	Yarmuth
Burchett	Gomez	Marchant	Sires	Trahan	Yoho
Burgess	Gonzalez (OH)	Marshall	Slotkin	Trone	Young
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	Massie	Smith (MO)	Turner	Zeldin
Butterfield	Gooden	Matsui			
Byrne	Gottheimer	McAdams			
Calvert	Granger	McBath	Amash	McClintock	
Carbajal	Graves (GA)	McCarthy			
Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	McCaul			
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	McCollum	Amodei	Holding	Pingree
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	McEachin	Baird	Huizenga	Quigley
Carter (TX)	Green (TX)	McGovern	Biggs	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Cartwright	Griffith	McHenry	Bishop (GA)	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Case	Grijalva	McKinley	Davis, Danny K.	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Casten (IL)	Grothman	McNerney	Duncan	Lipinski	Shimkus
Castor (FL)	Guest	Meadows	Gibbs	Loudermilk	Weber (TX)
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	Meeks	Golden	Marino	Wilson (FL)
Chabot	Haaland	Meng	Gosar	Mast	
Cheney	Hagedorn	Meuser	Hastings	Payne	
Chu, Judy	Harder (CA)	Miller			
Cicilline	Harris	Mitchell			
Cisneros	Hartzler	Moolenaar			
Clark (MA)	Hayes	Mooney (WV)			
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Moore			
Clay	Hern, Kevin	Morelle			
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Moulton			
Cline	Hice (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell			
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Mullin			
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	Murphy			
Cohen	Hill (AR)	Nadler			
Cole	Hill (CA)	Napolitano			
Collins (GA)	Himes	Neal			
Collins (NY)	Hollingsworth	Neguse			
Comer	Horn, Kendra S.	Newhouse			
Conaway	Horsford	Norcross			
Connolly	Houlahan	Norman			
Cook	Hoyer	Nunes			
Cooper	Hudson	O'Halleran			
Correa	Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez			
Costa	Hunter	Olson			
Courtney	Hurd (TX)	Omar			
Cox (CA)	Jackson Lee	Palazzo			
Craig	Jayapal	Pallone			
Crawford	Jeffries	Palmer			
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Panetta			
Crist	Johnson (LA)	Pappas			
Crow	Johnson (OH)	Pascarell			
Cuellar	Johnson (TX)	Pence			
Cummings	Jordan	Perlmutter			
Cunningham	Joyce (OH)	Perry			
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Peters			
Davids (KS)	Kaptur	Peterson			
Davidson (OH)	Katko	Phillips			
Davis (CA)	Keating	Pocan			
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (IL)	Porter			
Dean	Kelly (MS)	Posey			
DeFazio	Kelly (PA)	Pressley			
DeGette	Kennedy	Price (NC)			
DeLauro	Khanna	Raskin			
DelBene	Kildee	Ratcliffe			
Delgado	Kilmer	Reed			
Demings	Kim	Reschenthaler			
DeSaulnier	Kind	Rice (NY)			
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rice (SC)			
Deutch	King (NY)	Richmond			
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Riggleman			
Dingell	Kirkpatrick	Roby			
Doggett	Krishnamoorthi	Rodgers (WA)			

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—28

Amodei	Holding	Pingree
Baird	Huizenga	Quigley
Biggs	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Bishop (GA)	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Danny K.	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Duncan	Lipinski	Shimkus
Gibbs	Loudermilk	Weber (TX)
Golden	Marino	Wilson (FL)
Gosar	Mast	
Hastings	Payne	

□ 1901

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

END THIS SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a letter I received from a constituent last week. He writes:

"Being out of work and not knowing how many days or weeks it will take to get back to work leaves me worried. These days off are no fun. So please, make them worthwhile by standing firm against the stupid Trump wall."

"This colossal waste of government funds could be spent doing so many worthwhile projects: fix the water in Flint, Michigan; hire more people to process the paperwork of people who want to be citizens; give more people access to healthcare."

"If Democrats cave during this shutdown, it will all be wasted."

"We Federal workers are unhappy, but we've been through this before. We can stand the wait and the frustration. What we cannot stand is the racism, cruelty, and criminality of this administration."

"We are with you. Please be with us."

Mr. Speaker, my constituents are ready to go back to work. They resent having their livelihoods being used as bargaining chips, and even in this shutdown, they are very unhappy. They just want to do their work, and they are asking us to do ours.

COMMEMORATING MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, one week from today, our Nation celebrates the legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Tomorrow is Dr. King's birthday. He would be turning 90 if his life wasn't violently cut short in 1968.

Madam Speaker, it was November 3, 1983, when President Ronald Reagan signed a bill to mark the third Monday of every January as Martin Luther King Jr. Day. The holiday officially began 3 years later.

Born on January 15, 1929, in Atlanta, Georgia, Dr. King was the son of a Baptist minister. He went on to receive his own doctoral degree in theology.

Dr. King was a powerful orator, and his talents were on full display when he delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech in 1963. 250,000 people gathered outside the Lincoln Memorial to hear his speech, which peacefully called for the end of racism. It is still regarded as one of the most influential moments in American history.

Madam Speaker, I am thankful for all that Dr. King did to advance the civil rights of all Americans, and I am honored to commemorate his life and legacy.

SHUTDOWN STORIES

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, on Friday, several of my Democratic colleagues and I met with hardworking Americans who are living with the consequences of the ongoing Trump shutdown.

We met an FAA employee, working without a paycheck, who has two kids in college, and they need money for books as the new semester begins.

We met a Customs and Border Patrol employee who said his friends think he is on vacation, but a vacation does not include calling your mortgage lender and your auto loan company to tell them you may not make a payment. He said he never expected to get rich as a public servant, but he thought he would be able to buy formula for his 5-month-old daughter.

We met a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration employee who told us weather forecasts for the

Great Lakes will be impacted for months, which will, in turn, impact shipping.

We are on day 24 of the longest government shutdown in American history. Estimates say we are letting GDP growth take a hit of \$1.2 billion every week.

The President has to stop holding the health, safety, and paychecks of the American people hostage and reopen the government immediately, because 5,200 Federal workers in Michigan are working without pay or are furloughed. I guarantee you that every one of them has a story like the ones I shared.

EUROPEAN UNION SANCTIONS IRAN

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the European Union Caucus, I appreciate the EU has imposed sanctions on Iran for the first time in 3 years. Following the numerous plots against Iranian opposition leaders in Europe, the EU added two Iranians and a unit of the Iranian intelligence services to its terror list.

Iran has used its diplomatic facilities to plot attacks against its critics for decades. France concluded that Iran was behind a planned bombing attack on the Iranian opposition rally group in Paris last year. Germany arrested and expelled a high-ranking diplomat suspected of transporting explosives over the summer. The list of plots is endless, threatening European families.

The new sanctions are a good start, but more can and must be done. The EU should work hand-in-hand with America to hold Iran accountable for its promotion of terrorism throughout the world.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1915

DENOUNCING THE WORDS OF REPRESENTATIVE STEVE KING

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address what I call the tale of two Kings, one a Member of this body who wondered out loud to The New York Times why the terms "white nationalism" and "white supremacy" are offensive.

I would say to my colleague that the terms are offensive because the concepts are evil. And we have been counseled by Edmund Burke that all that is required for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing.

I have just introduced a resolution to express this august body's disapproval

of Mr. KING's comments and condemnation of white nationalism and white supremacy in all forms.

Today, I denounce the words of Representative STEVE KING, and I do so invoking the words of another King, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who, if he had been allowed to live, would be celebrating his 90th birthday tomorrow.

Dr. King counseled that: "We are going to be made to repent, not just for the hateful words and deeds of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people."

Madam Speaker, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in breaking the deafening silence and letting our resounding condemnation be heard.

HONORING OFFICER NATALIE CORONA

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and great sadness that I rise today to mourn the loss of 22-year-old Davis, California, police officer Natalie Corona, who was shot and killed a few days ago after what seemed to be a routine response to a traffic accident.

The motive remains unclear, but then what does it matter what the motive is? We have lost a beautiful, amazing young officer.

It comes just a few months after she was pinned as a new officer by her father, Merced Corona, who himself spent 26 years as a veteran of the Colusa County Sheriff's Office.

Young Natalie, after spending much of her time volunteering with the police force in Colusa County, graduated from the academy in July, an eager rookie, ready to protect and serve her community.

Even before joining the force herself, she frequently posted on social media to honor fallen officers and show support for the thin blue line.

Her police chief, Darren Pytel, had these words to say: "She was just an absolute star in the department and someone that pretty much every department member looked to as a close friend, a sister. . . . She just worked like you can't believe."

This is on the heels of Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. We are losing too many of our great officers in this country and California as well, especially a vibrant, young lady like Natalie Corona.

God bless her family and her memory.

BORDER WALL/AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLER

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, let's pay tribute to the thousands of America's patriots going to work with no

pay. It is wrong for the President to use his authority to harm our Republic. Public service employees hold our country together.

Take this story shared by Micah Maziar, an air traffic controller from Toledo, Ohio, who told his account of a new trainee struggling to make ends meet. He is not being paid. After a full day's work, a full shift in a very stress-filled job, the trainee reports to his apartment complex to pick up trash as part of a deal with his landlord to offset rent during this Trump shutdown. This is unacceptable.

The Commander in Chief holds our entire government hostage to his hare-brained notion that you can stop drug trafficking with a wall. The drug traffickers must be laughing up a storm. They already dig tunnels under the existing walls and fly over them, too.

To secure the border, our Nation needs thorough inspection of cargo. We need enhanced electronic surveillance through drones. Most of all, we need a President who understands you don't stop the drug trade by furloughing border agents without pay.

For the hundreds of thousands of America's hardworking Federal patriots and for the American people whom they serve, we must reopen the government immediately.

CELEBRATING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the University of Cincinnati.

In 1819, roughly 70 students were enrolled in what was then called the Cincinnati College. Today, nearly 46,000 students are enrolled at UC.

None other than Thomas Edison once credited UC with being important to the development of his education. President William Howard Taft, who later became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and is, by the way, the only American to hold both those offices, was educated at UC Law, as was Nicholas Longworth IV, who went on to represent Ohio's First Congressional District and later served as Speaker of this very House.

On a personal note, my wife, Donna, is a UC grad, as is our daughter, Erica, who graduated from UC's DAAP program.

We are fortunate to have such a tremendous, fine institution in our community.

Congratulations to the University of Cincinnati for achieving this significant milestone, and best of luck for another 200 years.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a question of privileges of the House.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the form of a resolution appear in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ESCOBAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the United States has always been a proud multicultural Nation;

Whereas since early in our history our Nation has recognized the strength that our diversity brings by making our national motto *E Pluribus Unum*;

Whereas on July 13, 2006, on the floor of the House of Representatives, comparing immigrants to livestock, Representative STEVE KING of Iowa stated, "We could also electrify this wire with the kind of current that would not kill somebody, but it would simply be a discouragement for them to be fooling around with it. We do that with livestock all the time.";

Whereas on March 8, 2008, in an interview with KICD Studios, Representative KING stated, "I don't want to disparage anyone because of their race, their ethnicity, their name—whatever their religion their father might have been . . . I'll just say this: When you think about the optics of a Barack Obama potentially getting elected President of the United States—I mean, what does this look like to the rest of the world? What does it look like to the world of Islam?";

Whereas on May 21, 2012, while speaking with constituents in Pocahontas, Iowa, Representative KING compared vetting immigrants to choosing hunting dogs saying, "You want a good bird dog? You want one that's going to be aggressive? Pick the one that's the friskiest.";

Whereas in July 2012, at a tele-town-hall, on President Barack Obama's place of birth, Representative KING stated, "It would have been awfully hard to fraudulently file the birth notice of Barack Obama being born in Hawaii and get that into our public libraries and that microfiche they keep of all the newspapers published. That doesn't mean there aren't some other explanations on how they might've announced that by telegram from Kenya. The list goes on. But drilling into that now, even if we could get a definitive answer and even if it turned out that Barack Obama was conclusively not born in America, I don't think we could get that case sold between now and November.";

Whereas on January 4, 2013, in a press release announcing the introduction of his bill, H.R. 140, Representative KING stated, "The current practice of ex-

tending U.S. citizenship to hundreds of thousands of 'anchor babies' must end because it creates a magnet for illegal immigration into our country. Now is the time to ensure that the laws in this country do not encourage law breaking.";

Whereas on July 24, 2014, in an interview with Newsmax discussing undocumented immigrants in the United States, Representative KING stated, "For everyone who's a valedictorian, there's another 100 out there who weigh 130 pounds—and they've got calves the size of cantaloupes because they're hauling 75 pounds of marijuana across the desert.";

Whereas on July 20, 2016, in an interview with The Washington Post, Representative KING stated, "The idea of multiculturalism, that every culture is equal—that's not objectively true.";

Whereas on July 18, 2016, in an appearance on MSNBC, Representative KING stated, "Where did any other subgroup of people contribute more to civilization [than White people]?";

Whereas on September 18, 2016, on Twitter, Representative KING stated, that "Cultural suicide by demographic transformation must end.";

Whereas on March 12, 2017, on Twitter, Representative KING shared a story about far-right Dutch politician Geert Wilders and added, "We can't restore our civilization with somebody else's babies.";

Whereas on March 13, 2017, on CNN, Representative KING stated, "I'd like to see an America that's just so homogenous that we look a lot the same" and "There's been this effort, we're going to have to replace that void with somebody else's babies. That's the push to bring in [so] much illegal immigration into America, living in enclaves, refusing to assimilate into the American culture and civilization.";

Whereas on June 12, 2018, Representative KING retweeted Mark Collett, a self-described "Nazi sympathizer";

Whereas on September 2, 2018, in an interview with Unzensuriert, a publication linked to a fascist Austrian political party, Representative KING stated, "What does this diversity bring that we don't already have? Mexican food, Chinese food, those things—well, that's fine. But what does it bring that we don't have that is worth the price? We have a lot of diversity within the U.S. already.";

Whereas on January 10, 2019, in the New York Times, Representative KING stated "White nationalist, White supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?";

Whereas Representative KING's statements have drawn praise from known White supremacists like former Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke;

Whereas Representative KING dishonors not only immigrants but every American with his racist and xenophobic rhetoric; and

Whereas Representative KING has failed to retract his statement and apologize to the Members of the House

or Americans across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa, by his despicable conduct, has dishonored himself and brought discredit to the House and merits the censure of the House for the same;

(2) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured;

(3) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa forthwith present himself in the well of the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

(4) Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Illinois will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 40. Condemning and censuring Representative STEVE KING of Iowa.

Whereas, on January 10, 2019, in an interview published by the New York Times, Representative STEVE KING asked, “White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive? Why did I sit in classes teaching me about the merits of our history and our civilization?”;

Whereas Representative KING’s comments legitimize white supremacy and white nationalism as acceptable in today’s society;

Whereas Representative KING’s comments are abhorrent to the founding principles of our Nation and our rich history of diversity and tolerance of those whose backgrounds and beliefs have made America the envy of the world; and

Whereas Representative KING’s comments reflect negatively on the House of Representatives.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that

One, Representative STEVE KING of Iowa be censured;

Two, Representative STEVE KING forthwith present himself in the well of

the House of Representatives for the pronouncement of censure; and

Three, Representative STEVE KING be censured with the public reading of this resolution by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

MR. PRESIDENT, OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I entered Bush Intercontinental Airport today, terminal B was shut down, shut down because, of course, we do not have enough TSA officers, as the terminals were shut down in Miami.

I understand the circumstances and the difficulties of these working people in this crisis of no paycheck and no opportunity to pay their bills.

At the same time, a headline in our local newspaper, “Coast Guard families left ‘in a fog,’”—families who have little babies with medical conditions, who cannot pay their bills. The reason, of course, is the Coast Guard comes under Homeland Security.

And a President who has the audacity to say they can adjust, let them adjust, where is the heart? Where is the recognition that we are jeopardizing our skies with air traffic controllers who are overworked and working overtime with no pay, TSA officers? I came home on Friday and gathered with those.

What about a Federal employee couple who has indicated that they have no ability to pay their bills and are taking money from their son’s scholarship fund?

Mr. President, open the government.

Finally, let me say to Mr. KING, it is shameful, your words, and I would offer that I join all of my colleagues in seeking censure.

CELEBRATING SCHOOL CHOICE

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, this week, I am delighted to celebrate the promise of school choice alongside thousands of teachers, students, and their families.

Every student deserves an excellent education, and school choice empowers parents to choose the right education for their children. Through school choice, all students have increased access to charter schools, magnet schools, private schools, homeschooling, and other innovative programs designed to help students achieve their goals.

When we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, we advanced reforms to widen the reach of school choice and empower families and communities.

I am proud of these accomplishments and look forward to continuing the work to protect and expand school choice and help students succeed.

□ 1930

REMEMBERING THE ABBAS FAMILY

(Ms. STEVENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Abbas family.

This beloved family perished last week in a car crash as they were heading back home from Michigan on a family vacation.

Northville and the Metro Detroit area have lost a cornerstone of our community. Issam and Dr. Rima Abbas were loving parents to their three beautiful children: Ali; Isabella; and their youngest, Giselle, who was only 7 years old.

As the children of immigrants from Lebanon, Rima was the granddaughter of the founder of the prominent mosque in which their memorial services were held, the Islamic Center of America in Dearborn.

They touched the lives of their neighbors of all faiths, and the interfaith community has come out in solidarity with the Abbas family.

My prayers are with their family and our community. They will always remain in our hearts, and we will cherish their lives for all time. We must act to make sure this never happens again.

BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, it is a sobering time to be here because we are in the 24th day of a government shutdown, something that none of us wanted, and something that could be fixed very, very quickly. I am hopeful that it will.

We have heard some speeches tonight from individuals calling on the President to open up the government. But the reality is that the House, in December, voted to fully fund the government, and all of the Democrats voted no, and the Senate voted no.

So here we are. We voted to keep the government open, and we provided border security at the same time. We need to do that.

Tonight, I think it is important that we have a discussion with the American people about why we think it is important to secure our border. Can we do both? Can we find \$5 billion in an almost \$4 trillion budget to secure our border? Can we open our government and make sure our government employees have the funds that they need to pay their bills? Absolutely, we can do that.

I am ready to work with those on the other side of the aisle. I find it so interesting how they have changed their position. I just want to review with everyone listening tonight about the position of some of those who are now, all of a sudden, voting no.

During the previous administration, all 54 Democrats in the Senate voted to double the length of a new border fence with Mexico, double the number of border agents to 40,000, and spend \$40 billion on border security. All the Democrats in the Senate, in the last administration, voted for \$40 billion for border security just a few years ago.

Before that, in 2006, 64 Democrats in the House joined Republicans to pass the Secure Fence Act to build 700 miles of fencing along the border. In the Senate, when we had 64 Democrats join the House to pass it, to build 700 miles of fencing, Hillary Clinton, Barack Obama, and CHUCK SCHUMER all voted for it.

Then Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER voted in favor of the 2007 DHS appropriations bill, which included \$1 billion for fencing along the southwest border. The same Speaker who said it is immoral now voted for money for fencing just a few years ago. I find that interesting.

And CHUCK SCHUMER voted for it, and he said: "Illegal immigration is wrong, plain and simple. Until the American people are convinced that we will stop future flows of illegal immigration, we will make no progress on dealing with the millions of illegal immigrants who are here now and on rationalizing our system of legal immigration."

Then he said: "Any immigration solution must recognize that we must do as much as we can to gain control of our borders as soon as possible."

This is the same CHUCK SCHUMER who now thinks that we shouldn't have it, but just a few years ago he did support it.

So why are we fighting to secure our border? It is because we care about people.

There is a drug crisis in this country, and the drugs are coming across our southern border into our States. I know they are in Missouri. We have to stop it.

I had the chance, in October, to go to a port of entry down in Arizona, the Nogales-Mariposa port of entry just south of Tucson. What I saw there was eye-opening.

What I saw is that we are at war there. It is a war between the drug cartels and our dedicated Border Patrol and Customs officials down there on the ground. Just last year, they confiscated 1½ million pounds of drugs, and they talked about how they had no idea how many more millions of pounds they didn't stop, but we know.

All of us here tonight who talk to our law enforcement at home, who talk to our families who have lost their children due to a heroin overdose, who talk about how much cocaine and meth is in our communities, those are the drugs that they didn't catch.

Last year, 72,000 Americans died from a drug overdose. Now think about that. That is more who died of a drug overdose than died during the entire Vietnam war. It is more people than last year died, in total, of car accidents and homicides. If you put all of the traffic fatalities and all of the homicides together, it doesn't equal the number of people who have died from drug overdoses. We have to stop this.

Part of the drugs coming across is fentanyl. They caught 1.2 tons of this deadly drug. That is enough, they tell me, to kill every person in the United States. It takes only 2 milligrams of fentanyl to overdose, so that could kill that many people.

In 2018, Customs and Border Patrol seized enough cocaine to fill more than 141 1-ton pickups. I wanted to make this poster because we all know what a pickup looks like, and you think of a 1-ton pickup. If you can picture, here are 141 of these 1-ton pickup trucks full of cocaine. That is how much that our Border Patrol caught. We don't know how much more they didn't catch.

Also, they caught enough methamphetamine to fill 124 pickups, 124 tons, and over 3 tons of heroin. In fact, 90 percent of the heroin in the United States comes across the southern border.

Now, we have an opioid crisis in this country, and I am doing everything I can in my district, and I know many of us are, doing what we can to address the opioid crisis. Heroin is a type of opioid; fentanyl is a type of opioid; and 90 percent of that is coming across our southern border.

What that ends up being is it ends up impacting people. Here is a poster of some people who have been impacted by the drug crisis we have in our country.

This mother and son, on the far right-hand side, she was addicted to meth, gave birth to her little boy, and he was drug addicted at birth and went through withdrawal.

The young man in the middle, Eamon, he passed away, sadly, due to a heroin overdose.

And Kristin and her daughter, Reese, she lost custody of Reese because of her drug addiction. She is trying desperately to get off drugs, but she has lost custody.

We have a crisis in our foster care system now because of the drug prob-

lem. We are having trouble finding enough individuals to become foster parents. There are so many children who have been taken away from their parents because of their drug addiction, and it is not safe for them to be home.

We have a drug crisis, and we have tons, literally tons, of drugs pouring across our southern border. That is why we have to find \$5.7 billion in order to secure our border.

But it is more than just the drugs. It is also our safety. It is our security.

Just last year, our Customs and Border Patrol interdicted 17,000 individuals who had a criminal record. That is how many they caught with a criminal record. But, sadly, there are a lot of people who make it across, who are here in our country because we don't have a border, and they end up hurting our families.

Just last month, our hearts broke for Officer Singh and his family, a police officer from California who did it right, who came here legally from Fiji, and whose dream was to become a police officer. He went through the training. He learned English, his third language. He went to the police academy, driving 4 hours every day for months in order to complete his police academy.

He was so proud to become a police officer, and he was a good one. He was respected; he was amazing; and he was brave. He was a legal immigrant we are so proud of.

Then, sadly, right around Christmas, he was shot and killed by an illegal immigrant, someone who had come across the southern border.

And you wonder why we think it is important to secure the border. It is because of heartbreaking stories like this. It is because of families who are losing their children to drugs. That is why we have to find the money, and we can do it.

My colleagues and I tonight want to share why this is so important, and why it is important that we get this done now.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER). She is new, but we are so thrilled that she is here. I would like her to come and share a little bit on this very important issue from West Virginia's perspective.

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with my colleagues to speak about the important issue of border security.

We are in the midst of a crisis on our southern border, and it is time for our colleagues across the aisle to stop playing politics and to start focusing on our national security.

While Washington Democrats toe the party line and oppose President Trump and anything he supports, our Nation is under assault from unchecked illegal immigration, from terrorists, from human traffickers, and from drug smugglers.

Sadly, as West Virginia and the Nation are battling an opioid epidemic,

the Democrats continue to turn a blind eye.

In the last year alone, the amount of fentanyl and heroin confiscated at our southern border was enough to kill every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The security of our Nation rests with a strong border. We need to build this wall.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to discuss this important issue.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments tonight. It is a serious matter before us right now as a nation. That is why we are having this conversation tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), and I thank him for being here this evening. I think he is the first person, certainly tonight and the other night we had a discussion, from California to be here, so I appreciate him coming. I would like to hear about what he thinks about where we are at and what we need to do.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative HARTZLER, for having this Special Order tonight and for allowing me to be part of it.

I join her in my great concern for the crisis that is happening at our southern border. I agree with our President that it is a humanitarian and national security crisis that has been ignored for far too long.

Being from California, I can name three names, just right off the top of my head, that are the sign of our porous borders and the tragedy we have seen from them.

We all remember Kate Steinle, killed in San Francisco with her family; Jamiel Shaw from southern California, needlessly killed; and, as Mrs. HARTZLER mentioned, most recently, Ronil Singh from central California, a police officer, as she mentioned, who did it the right way, serving in honor to help keep our streets safe, all mowed down by illegal immigrants in our country.

□ 1945

Now, some will downplay this. Some downplay the necessity of a strong fence at our southern border. There are areas of our border that already have barriers that are significantly better at preventing illegal trafficking.

In San Diego, illegal traffic has decreased by 92 percent since a physical barrier was constructed back in 1992. There are few situations that I can think of where 92 percent isn't seen as a win and as effective. The fact is that these barriers work.

There are long stretches of our southern border where even more sturdy fences would be more effective. Many of my Democratic colleagues seem to know this, but they are apparently more interested in obstructing this President than in reaching a com-

promise to reopen our government, secure our border, and provide disaster funding to the West Coast and the Southern States.

Now, this is only a few years after passionate speeches by major Democratic leaders and the votes to back it up. We saw, again, Mrs. Clinton, President Obama, Senator SCHUMER, as well as President Bill Clinton right at this dais a few years ago passionately speaking about the need for this.

It is about giving Border Patrol agents the tools they need to be successful in protecting our Nation's sovereignty from gunrunning, human trafficking, and the mass flow of high-risk drugs, as so eloquently outlined by Mrs. HARTZLER, by all of these violent gangs that have free access to our borders.

The complete and total lack of negotiation by our Democratic colleagues is telling. They are not happy to reopen the government. They are just fine with our porous border the way it is. I guess, does this poll well?

I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans are not happy with it. They want solutions for border security, for the coyotes who are preying on those who are seeking passage into this country—unspeakable things that happen to women in these crossings by these coyotes and others who take advantage of them. Is that compassion?

We seek legal entry for people who seek work permits for agriculture and other work needs and a DACA solution that we can all come to the table and find common ground on. So, indeed, real negotiations need to happen in good faith to reopen our government and secure our border, as is our duty to our sovereign Nation that we swear an oath to protect.

I thank Mrs. HARTZLER for yielding me the time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman; he makes a great point about the safety of the individuals who are coming here. Because we have this open border, it is incentivizing people to make this very dangerous trek.

Doctors Without Borders has reported that 30 percent of the women who make this trek, who have given their money to coyotes to bring them here, are sexually assaulted. Now, that should be upsetting for anyone. That is another reason I believe we need to close the border and then enable and help and work with individuals to come here legally.

I think the gentleman makes a great point, too, that there is a lot of negotiation that could take place right now if the Democrats would be willing to sit down. We do have the DACA situation. We do need more workers. We do need to work on our visas. We need to reform our immigration our laws so that individuals like Police Officer Singh and others who want to come and contribute can come here easier.

We all have an immigration story, and I support legal immigration. So

let's sit down. Let's talk about the changes that need to be made to our immigration system, but let's also secure our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) to share his thoughts on this matter, on why he thinks it is important that we secure our border.

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her efforts in organizing this Special Order this evening.

As we continue to fight for the safety and security of our fellow Americans, I want to highlight safety and security because that is our number one role in this country. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with many of my colleagues to address the significance of this crisis we are facing on our southern border.

Just last week, President Trump addressed the Nation from the Oval Office for the first time about the importance of border security and mentioned the devastating story of Robert Page, who was violently murdered by an illegal immigrant in my home State of Georgia. A 76-year-old grandfather's life was needlessly cut short at the hands of an individual who was in our country illegally.

There are far too many families in our country who are coping with tragic losses like this as a result of insufficient border security. The bottom line is, whatever we are doing for border security, it is not working. We must do more.

That is not to mention the illegal drugs that are coming into the United States. As the President mentioned in his letter to Congress, 300 Americans are killed every week from heroin, and 90 percent of that heroin comes across that southern border. This is a humanitarian and national security crisis, and it must be addressed immediately, and it must be done properly.

We are supposed to be a nation of laws. How can we stand by and let lawlessness continue?

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to keep the best interests of the American citizens in mind as they continue to deny funds for commonsense solutions to this growing crisis.

It is this body. It is the United States Congress that appropriates funds. Then it is sent to the President. I say this: Congress, appropriate the funds. Let's build a wall. Let's send the bill to the President and reopen this government.

With an average of 60,000 illegals a month on our southern border, our law enforcement professionals must have the additional resources to successfully execute their jobs and keep the American people safe.

From the day President Trump announced his candidacy, he made it clear that border security was a priority and his administration has been built on promises made are promises kept. I can tell you that the good folks in Georgia's 12th Congressional District want to secure our border with a

wall. We want to do it the right way. We must stand behind our President. The security of our Nation depends on it.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman makes some excellent remarks. The 300 deaths a day due to overdoses, the opioid crisis with 90 percent of the opioids coming across the southern border, that is why we have got to secure the border.

I agree; we have a humanitarian crisis. There are 60,000 illegals caught a month trying to cross our border. In Missouri's Fourth District, we don't have very many towns that even have 60,000 individuals. That is a lot of people per month coming across.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), my colleague. I thank the gentleman for coming tonight, and I look forward to hearing what he has to share about this important topic.

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Missouri for taking this on this evening, to make a point that we are not just talking politics here, but we are talking lives. We are talking freedom. We are talking opportunity. We are talking security.

We must secure our border, Madam Speaker. Driving to the Detroit airport today to fly here, I took note of the number of walls that have been erected along Interstate 94 just to secure the communities developed along the highway from noise and sight problems.

We take a lot of effort to do those type of things, but we have some people who, for some reason—political, I believe—want to stop a wall or a barrier from being developed that the people of this country want to see.

It is not because, as it has been said, that we hate people outside of the walls. It is that we love people inside of the walls, and we want to pass that love on to people who desire the American Dream and desire to be part of the American ideal.

We see 31 percent of all the women migrating up from the southern countries who are sexually assaulted on the way up, and 17 percent of the males have been sexually assaulted on the way up. We have a human trafficking problem that reaches all across the United States. A lot of those problems result from a border wall that is not secured.

We have an opioid epidemic in our country that is devastating the dreams of a generation or more. There are too many families in my district and your districts who know the pain and suffering that comes from this crisis.

Just a couple of months ago, our community lost a young man, Christopher Risner, from Jackson, a wonderful young guy, a good athlete in high school and student in college, until he got caught in the opioid, heroin abuse trap. Fighting to extricate himself from it, surviving it, he fought the battle valiantly. He went through a number of treatment centers, came out, and began to work his life forward.

I had the privilege of going to a number of forums, speaking to high school students and others, telling his story of the battle that he faced and what he was doing to try to succeed and change. But it was just 2 months ago that he lost that battle, and I stood in front of his open casket and thought: Are we doing everything we can to secure our people against this type of scourge?

Madam Speaker, I suggest that we aren't if we are unwilling, for political reasons, to stop a President, to stop many Members of this Congress from doing what we know needs to be done.

All of us have heartbreaking stories from our back home experiences of families that are losing loved ones far too soon.

I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done to combat the opioid crisis. Sitting on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I saw the number of bills that we put forward—I believe, 70 in all—and saw the President sign that just last November.

But we must redouble our efforts. And as we do that, one priority is we must keep these deadly drugs off our streets in the first place. In fiscal year 2018 alone, U.S. Customs and Border Protection seized a total of 1.7 million pounds of narcotics.

To curb the flow of drugs into our communities, we must secure our southern border. There is no doubt we need a comprehensive solution. A border wall is just one component of what we need to do. We also need more surveillance technology, more border agents, and more resources to address the humanitarian crisis at the border, yes. But as the experts at the border tell us, a border wall, a security barrier must be part of that solution.

At a time when hundreds of Americans die each week from overdoses, we need to give our border agents all the tools they need to stem the tide of these deadly drugs and to protect them as well. It is time for Speaker PELOSI to get serious about border security, to negotiate to a solution.

Let's stop the political games and negotiate a solution that keeps the American people safe, keeps illicit drugs off our streets, puts an end to this partial shutdown, and, may I suggest as well, gives greater opportunity and security to those who deem it their purpose in life to legally experience the American Dream. We want to see that happen, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, that is so powerful. I thank the gentleman for sharing Christopher's story. I can't imagine how helpless that made him feel to stand at his casket, at his funeral, and to realize that we here in Congress have passed a lot of bills dealing with opioids to address this, but it is still flowing across our borders. We need to do more.

So I thank the gentleman for sharing that story. We do need to work in a bipartisan fashion. These bills that Representative WALBERG talked about

were passed in a bipartisan fashion, over 70 bills. Democrats and Republicans came together last year and said: This is a crisis. Let's send this.

Now we need to complete that. We need to complete and stop them from coming in to begin with, in addition to continuing to provide money for people in treatment and our law enforcement and mental health issues and those other things, to go after the opioid crisis. But we need to stop them flowing here to begin with. So I thank the gentleman for sharing that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON). He is right there at the border in the State of Texas, along the edge. I thank the gentleman for being here tonight and would like to hear what he has to say about this topic.

□ 2000

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I am very concerned, to my friend and the gentlewoman from Arizona, to put it mildly. I am troubled that our Nation and our Nation's leaders here in this great body of the United States House of Representatives would not put politics aside and put our country and our citizens' safety first. It is the number one job. It is the most important job, to provide for a common defense and to ensure the safety of the United States citizens. We can never be distracted from that, and we can never allow partisan politics from fulfilling that first responsibility and duty.

I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for bringing this discussion to the floor so that we can speak directly to the American people about our strong support for our Commander in Chief who is simply asking for the tools and resources to do that which he ran for the Presidency on, was elected to do, and is now doing everything with unwavering commitment to follow through on that promise to secure the border. Border walls and barriers are a fundamental component of security.

As a Texan, I can tell you being on the front-lines—and the gentlewoman knows this as well being on the front-lines as well from the great State of Arizona—that this is costing our States billions of dollars, \$12 billion in the great State of Texas. We see the drugs that are flowing in, the gangs, the crimes, and the criminal activities.

Here is a statistic: since 2011, 186,000 illegal immigrants were charged with more than 290,000 criminal offenses costing \$1 billion, tearing apart families and devastating communities. And this President is asking for the resources necessary to secure our border.

Madam Speaker, I say to Mrs. HARTZLER, I find it ironic that Democrats have spoken in favor and have even supported physical barriers. I find it hypocritical that Speaker PELOSI has talked about walls being immoral when she has spent probably half of her life being protected by those very walls. I find it disingenuous that

Democrats have said that they actually want to do something to secure the border; they just don't want to have anything to do with walls or fencing.

Madam Speaker, I have got a list—and I don't have enough time—but last Congress, which was my first term in Congress, we put several bills to do just that, to secure the border and stop illegal immigration, from Kate's Law to No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, and Securing America's Future.

For the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, 188 Democrats voted no; Kate's Law, 166 Democrats voted against it; Securing America's Future Act to give DACA recipients peace of mind, 190 Democrats voted against it.

Then they were crying out saying that we have to abolish ICE, abolish the people who risk their lives to keep us safe. Then we put a very simple resolution: we support you, we love you, we are behind you, we know what a tough job you have; and 133 Democrats voted present, and 34 voted against that resolution. I wonder how that makes the folks in uniform who defend this country and protect our communities feel.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. HARTZLER for her generosity in allowing me to speak in her time and during this Special Order. I would just call on my Democrat colleagues and the Democrat leaders to be leaders, not politicians, and put this country first and work in good faith with this President who has been willing to negotiate every step of the way to secure this border and protect our people.

God bless America.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for sharing those heartfelt words and those statistics. They really matter. I totally agree with the gentleman that our number one job is to keep America safe. The number one job is to keep America safe. That is why we want to find \$5.7 billion to build the wall and reopen government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) to share his thoughts on where we are at today.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for not only her service but also this Special Order. This is such an important issue.

Madam Speaker, having spent so many nights all night on the border, it is incredible what you see down there. But what is even worse is what the Border Patrol can tell you about, things that you can find on the internet, there are videos and there are pictures. I have daughters, and there are some things I would just rather not see.

But as long as our border is porous and as long as we don't have a wall or a fence where we need it, people are being drawn into this country. Mexico alone has about 130 million people. Obviously we can't have an influx of 100 million people without destroying the

economy, and then we are no longer able to provide light to so much of the world.

But if we secure our border—wall, fence, barrier—where we need it, it cuts off the tens of billions—maybe over 100 billion now—going to the drug cartels and the corruption comes to a crawl. But as long as we have this porous border, we are funding some of the most evil and horrendous human tragedy that is going on anywhere in the world.

The police try to stand up—it is not hard to see pictures, find the stories—mayor—they end up with their head cut off and put on a pike.

How callous, how mean-spirited does somebody have to be and how politically driven to say “we don't care about that”? This is a political issue. We don't want the President to have a win, so we are just going to let the border stay as porous as it is.

They talk of rape trees where women are tied to the trees and repeatedly raped. Objectively groups say that maybe 37 percent or more are molested sexually, normally multiple times. How callous do you have to be to say, yeah, but this is political. It is helping our party. We want to keep it going.

It is time to do the right thing by the people of the United States and, for heaven's sake, to do the right thing by the people of Mexico.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

To the gentleman's point, a reminder that in 2006, 64 Democrats in the House joined the Republicans to pass the Secure Fence Act to build 700 miles of fencing along the border, including Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and CHUCK SCHUMER. Then the next year there was some money in an appropriations bill for the wall, and both Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER voted for it. So I think the gentleman is right. It is time to work together to get this done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN), who is a new member of Congress.

I am glad to see Dr. MARK GREEN. I am glad that he is here. We are excited to have the gentleman serving with us here in the body and being a former service member from the Army who is part of the elite unit that helped capture Saddam Hussein.

The gentleman knows a little bit about security, so I appreciate the gentleman's sharing his thoughts on where we are at tonight.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri for putting this Special Order together highlighting the need for border security and, most importantly, to put our American citizens first.

We could spend our time debating what a physical barrier should consist of, but let's make one thing clear: whether it is in the form of a wall or a fence or some barrier combined with 21st century surveillance technology

and increased Border Patrol agents, a barrier is an effective defense against entry by criminals, gang members, drug smugglers, and, yes, even terrorists.

My colleagues across the aisle are now arguing that physical barriers are ineffective. Some have even said that they are immoral. Now, this is not the position they held in the recent past. President Trump has asked for \$5.7 billion to help secure the border. Under President Obama, Democrats were willing to spend \$40 billion for border security.

What has changed?

Is it possible the only difference is the occupant in the White House?

Some argue that border security is not necessary because too few known or suspected terrorists have been captured on the southern border. They say that only eight have been captured. I would suggest to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that one terrorist gaining entry into this country is too many. I would like to point out that there were only 19 terrorists who carried out the attacks on 9/11—just 19. The fact that we know ISIS is encouraging their followers to try to enter the United States across our porous southern border should itself warrant better scrutiny.

This leads me to direct some questions to my colleagues and friends across the aisle.

Is it worth the risk?

Is it worth the possibility that one or two or a dozen or 19 terrorists could cross our southern border and carry out an attack that kills innocent American men and women?

I would pay \$5.7 billion to stop the next 9/11.

Terrorism is not the only threat to our national security. In 2017, an estimated 72,000 Americans died from drug overdoses with the biggest increase in drug overdose deaths being attributed to fentanyl and heroin. It has been reported that roughly 85 percent of the fentanyl and 90 percent of the heroin is coming across our southern border.

Does that death toll not warrant putting aside the issues with our President long enough on this national crisis to fund additional barriers and to fund additional and better drug detection technology and surveillance technology to try to stop the flow of these deadly drugs across our southern border?

Would it be worth it if we saved 1,000 lives? 100? A dozen?

What number would justify putting differences aside and joining this effort?

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his perspective, both as a doctor and as a military officer. His speaking of security means a lot. I think it is a good question.

What number is it going to take?

Are we really going to say: let's work together and let's do this?

I think we need to sit down right now. I am hopeful maybe this week we will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) to come share what he thinks maybe we could do this week to get this government opened and at the same time secure our border.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her efforts on this Special Order.

I don't know that I can add a whole lot to what has been said. But let me tell you about a conversation I had with a liberal who did not believe in a wall. He didn't think it worked. He happened to go to the national championship game between Clemson and Alabama.

I asked him: How was the game?

Of course, he was a Clemson fan.

I said: Did you have tickets?

He said: Yes.

I said: Let me ask you, did you have any trouble getting in?

He said: No, I had tickets.

I said: Did you go to a point of entry?

Yeah, we had a line.

I said: Well, could you not just walk in? Was there a wall?

He said: No, there was a fence.

I said: Okay, there was a fence. But was there a barrier, whether concrete or steel? Was there a way that you could not get in and you had to go in to a certain point of entry?

He said: Yes.

I said: Well, explain to me what is different with our country? If anybody can walk in that stadium, would they not take your seat? Would they not violate what you paid for?

He just kind of looked at me.

I said: Do you not see the similarities?

He did, but he didn't want to admit it.

Madam Speaker, I am very frustrated with the inaction of Congress. I am appalled that we haven't taken the security for our great Nation seriously.

How many Kate Steinles are going to have to be shot?

How many Mollie Tibbetts are going to have to be raped and killed?

How many police officers on the border are going to be shot before we say that we have got a crisis in this country?

I have got a chart behind me that shows what \$5 billion is to our total Federal budget spending. It is one-tenth of 1 percent. Madam Speaker, you try to look and see what percentage this is. You really can't see it. So as has been said, it is not about the money. I really don't think that those who argue against it can really say that they don't work, as my friend who went to the college football game knows it works, because he said it did.

□ 2015

Now is the time to take action, not to hold this President in contempt, like has been done, for political reasons, having the safety of this country and all Americans at risk.

We shouldn't even have to have this debate. I urge Congress to take action. I urge Congress to put partisan politics behind.

Let's do right for the country. Let's do right for America.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I love the analogy that the gentleman just shared about the Clemson game and going into a football game and how you have a ticket and there is a fence and you go through a point of entry and how the system works that way. It is common sense for us. So I thank the gentleman for sharing that.

I would like to visit with someone else who has a lot of common sense. We serve on the Committee on Agriculture together. We are from rural America, and we just have some common sense about these things.

The gentleman is from Washington State, and I would love to hear his thoughts about the importance of securing our border as well as reopening government.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend Mrs. HARTZLER from Missouri for putting this evening together to help us make some important points about a very important issue facing our country. So I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me some time.

I just wanted to relate a couple of instances. Madam Speaker, last June I had the opportunity to tour the same southern border area that President Trump toured just this past week. In fact, he was briefed by some of the same officials that I was, including Acting Chief Patrol Agent Raul Ortiz of the Rio Grande Valley sector. It was a very interesting conversation.

Chief Ortiz said, so far in 2019, his sector has apprehended people from 41 countries around the world. On a single day, Chief Ortiz's sector apprehended 133 people from countries other than Mexico or countries in Central America.

Madam Speaker, we absolutely have a crisis at the border. It is a humanitarian crisis. Even President Obama said as much back in 2014.

President Trump now is, rightly, citing the growing numbers of families and unaccompanied minors crossing the border as a crisis, yet he is met with partisan criticism for saying so.

The numbers will tell you the truth. Just last month, 20,000 migrant children were brought illegally to our country—20,000. Our border facilities just are not equipped to handle this influx of families and minor children. We are being overrun. Therefore, this results in a humanitarian crisis.

Securing the border and coming to a solution on immigration reform should not be a partisan fight, but, rather, we should see this as an opportunity to find the common ground about which the gentlewoman was speaking.

Americans support a deal to secure our border, reform our immigration

system, and—another point—provide certainty to DACA recipients.

Just this weekend, I polled my constituents on this very solution. You know what they told me? Madam Speaker, 69.8 percent said they support a border security and DACA solution compromise deal. President Trump has made it clear that he is open to a broader immigration reform deal that includes DACA recipients if the border is secured.

So I think our time to achieve both is right now. The fact that we have a crisis at the border must be addressed. But congressional Democrats must be willing to make a deal with President Trump to support broader solutions for our Nation.

Speaker PELOSI's flippant comment of being willing to only give a single dollar for a barrier at the border, that is a slap in the face to the men and women, like Chief Ortiz, who are working selflessly to keep our Nation safe.

Madam Speaker, let's reopen the government, secure our border, and reform our broken immigration system. We can do all those things.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Well said. This is so important. And we have a moment in time right now in the history of our country where we have had the government—part of it—shut down for 24 days, yet we have, like the gentleman said, all of these individuals coming into our country, some of them terrorists or gang members hurting our citizens.

So here is an opportunity to come together and work in a bipartisan fashion to fix our broken immigration laws. I agree that the DACA situation needs to be taken care of, and we need more agricultural workers. We need to expand our visas. We need to expand in several areas. We need to streamline the process.

Right now there are 600,000 individuals in the process of trying to come here legally into our country. I don't know if the gentleman has worked with some of the individuals. I know, in my own district, my office and I are helping some individuals who are trying to get their family members here legally.

It has been very interesting to see the paperwork that they have to go through and the amount of work. The paperwork that I have seen has been even this high, the documentation that they have to submit. Then they have money that they pay along the way, and then there is such a large time frame. Some have waited over a year, 2 years, or more to go through this process legally.

But it is worth it because they want to live the American Dream, and I applaud them. But we need to streamline it and help those individuals who are going through the process to get here and make it easier, the ones who want to be upright citizens and contribute.

But the problem is that it is not fair, for those 600,000 individuals who are trying to come here, who are waiting in line, to just have somebody go

across the border and not follow our laws, disregard our laws. It is just not right.

So it is important that we build this wall, that we come together in a bipartisan fashion to find a solution to this, that we find \$5.7 billion, which is hardly anything.

You saw the chart earlier from Representative NORMAN about what a small sliver of our entire budget that would be. Surely all these lives of individuals and our families' security and safety are worth finding that sliver amount of money.

We pay over \$50 billion every year in foreign aid, and we want \$5.7 billion for a wall. Madam Speaker, \$50 billion we send to other countries, many times for them to secure their border, yet we can't find \$5.7 billion or we can't get support for that from the other side of the aisle so that we can secure our own border. That just doesn't make sense.

We can do better.

I appreciate all of my colleagues who have come down tonight to have this conversation on this topic and to talk about how it can come about for us to come together to find this solution, reopen government, and to make sure that we have a secure border for our Nation, to stop the flow of drugs, and to keep our country safe.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker on Friday, January 11, 2019, announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 24. An Act to provide for the compensation of Federal and other government employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 15, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself, Mr. EMMER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. HAGEDORN):

H.R. 527. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the

Weeks Law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 528. A bill to provide a safe harbor from licensing and registration for certain non-controlling blockchain developers and providers of blockchain services; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 529. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a national intersection and interchange safety construction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 530. A bill to provide that certain actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 531. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may only be removed for cause, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 532. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to use alternatives to detention for certain vulnerable immigrant populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 533. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to require the head of each executive agency to consider the existence of qualified training programs of contractors in the award of certain contracts; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 534. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, in relation to requiring adrenoleukodystrophy screening of newborns; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 535. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to shall designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BUDD, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 536. A bill to provide tax relief for the victims of Hurricane Florence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 537. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COHEN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 538. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require a quarterly report on security clearances for individuals working in the White House or the Executive Office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 539. A bill to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. REED, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 540. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGÓ,

Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 541. A bill to limit the separation of families at or near ports of entry; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 542. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SIREN:

H.R. 543. A bill to require the Federal Railroad Administration to provide appropriate congressional notice of comprehensive safety assessments conducted with respect to intercity or commuter rail passenger transportation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 544. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide accrual of annual

and sick leave for Federal employees of an agency subject to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 40. A resolution condemning and censuring Representative Steve King of Iowa; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BASS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 41. A resolution rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Post Offices (e.g., naming post offices; creating)—Article I, Section 8, clause 7 provides Congress with the power to establish post offices.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. SIREN:

H.R. 543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (clause 18), which grants Congress the power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 27.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law"

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.J. Res. 28.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. ALLRED, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BERA, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 26: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 31: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 38: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 92: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 95: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BACON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. LAMB, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 96: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 116: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 117: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 125: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 141: Mr. LAMB, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 150: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 154: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 190: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 195: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 230: Mr. ROUDA and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 273: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 280: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 282: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 294: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 296: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 330: Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROUDA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 350: Mr. CASE and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 367: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 371: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 372: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 415: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 444: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 446: Mr. ROUDA, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 489: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 504: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 511: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 512: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. COMER and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 18: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. KHANNA.

H. Res. 17: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H. Res. 23: Mr. LAMB.

H. Res. 35: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H. Res. 37: Mrs. FLETCHER.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.J. Res. 27, Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.J. Res. 28, Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.